THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.—JULY, 1883.—No. 31.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE ON MARRIAGE.

De Consensu ad Matrimonium requisito. Billuart. Paris, Migne, 1841.
De Matrimonio Christiano. Perrone. Rome, Propaganda, 1858.
De Re Sacramentaria. De Augustinis. Woodstock, Maryland, 1878.
De Impedimentis Matrimonii. Moser. Paris, Migne, 1841.
Compendium Theologiæ Moralis. Gury, with Ballerini's notes, Rome, Propaganda, 1877.
The Calling of a Christian Woman. Dix. New York, Appleton, 1883.

CARGOES of a polygamous sect, fierce, fanatical and aggressive, are annually dumped on our shores. They are gathered in the slums of England, Scotland, and other parts of Northern Europe, which rejoices to be freed from their baleful influence on public morals. They swarm in one of our largest Territories and are spreading through the States. The daily press of May 14th, 1883, records a public meeting held in Harford County, Maryland, one of a series, to propagate the principles of Mormonism. It was largely attended. The "apostles" of this sect publicly and privately announce their purpose of endeavoring to change the whole order of our domestic society. Monogamy, according to them, must go down, no matter how well established in the customs of our people and by our civil laws. They look on it as a mere prejudice, to be removed by the new light emanating from the *Book of Mormon.* Their propagandism is zealous. When pushed into a corner by the arguments of a champion of monog-

amy, they claim direct and personal inspiration for their belief; and although admitting the divinity of Jesus Christ and the inspiration of the New Testament, they say it has been supplemented by the new revelation. It is true that our civil laws either condemn or ignore their theories; but they do not act. Our government seems to be conducted in regard to this matter on the principle of letting the evil alone, with the hope that it will die of inherent rottenness. At any rate, we seem to be willing to let the deluge come after us, content to have this generation take care of itself.

But it is not likely that Mormonism will die from natural causes, for it appeals directly to the strongest passions of human nature, and gains recruits not only by emigration from without but also by accession from within the United States. The vastness of our territory prevents this evil, like that of Socialism, which also prevails among us, from obtruding itself too closely on our attention; but a hundred years hence, perhaps sooner, when a thicker population will have brought men into closer and consequently more offensive relations, in regard to these matters, our neglect or pusillanimity will be bitterly blamed by a posterity that will have to reap what we are sowing, and to destroy with difficulty what we could have uprooted with ease.

On the one hand, this organized sect assails the unity and sanctity of marriage by doctrinal and practical simultaneous polygamy; on the other, the frequency and facility of divorce among the people of the United States, by establishing a system of "consecutive" polygamy, sap the foundation of the whole social order, and are not less destructive of Christian morality than Mormonism itself. The difference is slight between a man who has ten wives at the same time, in the same place, and him who has ten in the same or in different States of the Union, all living and all divorced but one. Yet the latter state of affairs is as possible as the former, as a glance at the statistics of divorce will show. "In the New England States alone families are broken up at the rate of two thousand every year. And again note this, that, while the laws protecting marriage have been thus gradually weakened, and facilities for divorce extended, crimes against chastity, morality and decency have been steadily increasing. In Massachusetts, from 1860 to 1870, during which time divorces have increased two and one-half times, while marriages have increased hardly four per cent., and while all convictions for crime have increased hardly one-fifth,—those crimes known as being 'against chastity, morality and decency,' filthy crimes, loathsome, infamous, nameless crimes, have increased threefold."[1] . . . "The following" are the "ratios of divorce to mar-

[1] "The Calling of a Christian Woman" (page 124), Rev. Morgan Dix, S.T.D. Published by D. Appleton & Co., New York. 1883.

riage: Connecticut, 1 divorce to every 10.4 marriages; Vermont, 1 to 13; Massachusetts, 1 to 21; New Hampshire, about 1 to 9; Maine, 1 to 9 or 8; Rhode Island, 1 to 10. This is not true of New England alone. In Ohio, for example, the ratio of divorces to marriages has increased from 1 to 26 in 1865, to 1 to 17 in 1881."[1] This statement regarding Ohio of Rev. Samuel W. Dilke, Corresponding Secretary of the New England Divorce Reform League, may be supplemented by a passage from a recent report on the relative increase of divorce read before the Ohio Episcopal Convention: "At the ratio since 1870, in twenty years, divorces in Ohio will equal the marriages. Five-sixths of the divorces granted in 1882 were for causes not recognized by the Bible. Collusion and fraud prevail to an alarming extent."[2] It is not necessary to quote more. The looseness of legislation regarding marriage in all of the United States is notorious, and should be an answer to those who hope that Mormonism will die out of its own accord. Human passion and loose laws are its chief champions, and the Protestant sects are inadequate to resist its onward progress. They see their creeds melting away in an ocean of doubt and unbelief, like icebergs drifting into southern latitudes; and they stand wringing their hands in hopeless despair, because Christian morality will not survive the loss of her sister Christian faith, whom they murdered in the sixteenth century. Every honest man sees the gulf into which the frequent disruption of the marital relation will eventually bring us. Better than any one else could say it, the learned and saintly Pontiff, Leo XIII., has summed up the consequences of divorce in these words:[3] "Divorce renders marriage contracts changeable; weakens the mutual love of the contracting parties; gives inducements to unfaithfulness; is injurious to the rearing and education of children; breaks up the domestic relations; sows dissensions among families; lessens and degrades the dignity of woman, who is thus exposed to be cast off, after having been the slave of man's passions. And as nothing conduces more to the destruction of families, and the destruction of national power than corruption of morals, it is easily seen how hostile to the prosperity of the family and of the State are the divorces which spring from the corrupt morals of the people, and as experience teaches open the door and lead the way to greater public and private degradation."

All sincere Protestants subscribe to these words of the Holy Father. They know and admit that the Catholic Church is not responsible for raising the sluices of divorce, but that its possibility arises from the looseness of Protestant teaching and practice.

[1] Idem, p. 127. [2] New York *Sun*, May 13, 1883.

[3] Encyclical of February 10th, 1880, found in "Acta quæ apud Sanctam Sedem," etc., vol. xii.

They destroyed the sanctity of marriage when they denied its sacramental character. "It is hardly necessary to remind the reader of the obsequiousness of Cranmer in the matter of the divorce of Henry VIII.; of the conduct of Luther and Melanchthon in the case of the Landgrave of Hesse; of the abortive *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum* in the reign of Edward VI.; and of John Milton's tractate addressed to Parliament on the *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*."[1] "From the total of marriages registered in the several States those contracted and solemnized by Roman Catholics must be deducted; for they, all honor to them, allow no divorce *a vinculo*, following literally the command of our Lord Jesus Christ."[2]

The Protestant bishop of Maine says: "Laxity of opinion and teaching on the sacredness of the marriage bond and on the question of divorce, originated among the Protestants of Continental Europe in the sixteenth century. It soon began to appear in the legislation of Protestant States on that continent, and nearly at the same time to affect the laws of New England. And from that time to the present it has proceeded from one degree to another in this country, until, especially in New England, and in States most directly affected by New England opinions and usages, the Christian conception of the nature and obligations of the marriage bond find scarcely any recognition in legislation, or must thence be inferred, in the prevailing sentiment of the community."[3]

In contrast to the looseness and weakness of the Protestant reformers regarding marriage, how grandly the Roman Pontiffs loom up in history as the champions of its sanctity and indissolubility! We remember Nicholas I. defending its sanctity against the Emperor Lothair; Urban II. and Paschal II., against Philip I., of France; Cælestine III. and Innocent III., against Philip the Fair, forcing him to reinstate Ingelburga in her position as his wife; Clement VII. and Paul III., against Henry VIII.; and Pius VII., against the powerful Napoleon I.; and then we look with contempt upon Luther and Melanchthon truckling to the brutal passions of a petty German prince, sanctioning bigamy for the sake of a little political assistance given to their revolt against the old Church.

But, although Protestants and infidels know in a general way that the Catholic Church does not tolerate divorce, their information in regard to the Catholic doctrine on marriage is not very clear nor very full. Many of them do not take the trouble to study her teaching on this or any other subject, and yet there is among some a desire for more information regarding it. The observer must have recently remarked from time to time inquiries made in

[1] "Calling of a Christian Woman," p. 135. [2] Idem, p. 123.
[3] Idem (quoted by Dr. Dix).

the daily press, showing that knowledge in this matter is sought for. It might be found with ease from the nearest Catholic priest or in the usual text-books of theology; but the average Protestant does not wish to consult a priest, and the text-book of theology is in an unknown tongue.

It may be well, therefore, to give a short statement of Catholic teaching on the chief points of marriage, especially on those that will most interest the Protestant or the infidel inquirer.

Marriage, under the law of nature, was a mere contract, seldom, however, divested of a religious character. It is even in the law of nature intentionally indissoluble; for it is a union of two hearts, pledging to each other undying love. In this union children are to be brought up to maturity by their parents; and these parents, in old age, are to be supported by their grateful children. The unity of the family is thus preserved intact.

The learned Romagnosi[1] thus sums up the reasons for considering the marriage tie indissoluble: "In questa politica fisiologia la famiglia si comincio col matrimonio, si prosegue colla educazione e si finisce coll' assistere alla vechiezza."

The consent of the parties to this contract should be both internal and external, mutual, free, and deliberate. This natural contract was elevated to the dignity of a sacrament by Christ.

Firstly, then, let us discuss the indissolubility of the sacrament of marriage; and secondly, point out some of the impediments which render it either illicit or invalid.

It is an article of Catholic faith, defined in the 7th canon of the 24th session of the Council of Trent, that the consummated marriage of Christians can never be dissolved as to the *vinculum*, or bond, save by the death of either party. There is no exception to this rule. The Pope himself cannot make one, for he has no right to dispense with the divine law. Where there has been mutual consent, and no impediment nor informality, the married person is married for life. This doctrine was denied by Calvin, who permitted divorce, *a vinculo*, for cause of adultery; by Luther, who permitted it even for theft or any sin, or frequent quarrelling, or if one of the parties remained too long absent; while Bucer taught that a man could divorce his wife as often as he found her disagreeable; and she could divorce him for a similar reason.[2] No matter what crime a Christian man or woman commits, it does not break the matrimonial chain, according to the teaching of Catholic faith. There is, indeed, in the Catholic Church a partial divorce permitted. It is from bed and board only, and is granted in the case of adultery, or for other grave causes. The Church considers the

[1] "Instit. di Civil. fil.," tom. i. p. 431.

[2] "De Augustinis, De Re Sacrament.," vol. ii., p. 282.

marriage contract as indissoluble by its very nature, but especially since its elevation to the dignity of a sacrament which represents the union of Christ with his Church; which union is indissoluble, for the Divine Word will never lay aside the humanity which He assumed. Even Protestant jurists, with a higher instinct than Protestant theologians, although denying the sacramental character of marriage, recognize it as "something more than a mere contract. It is rather to be deemed an institution of society founded upon the consent and contract of the parties."[1] The whole of Catholic tradition is in favor of the indissolubility of marriage. The testimony of the Fathers on the subject is too long to quote, and it may be readily found in any text-book of Catholic theology. The voice of universal Catholic tradition on this matter is heard in the decree of Pope Eugene IV., approving the Council of Florence, which gave expression to the faith of the United Greek and Latin Churches in the fifteenth century: "Although for cause of fornication, separation from bed and board is allowed, yet it is not lawful to contract another marriage, since the bond of a marriage lawfully contracted is perpetual." Let us pass, then, to the Bible.

There are five passages in the New Testament which bear directly on the indissolubility of marriage, *a vinculo*. Of these three are clear and absolute. The first is found in Mark x., from verse 2 to verse 12, inclusive. We quote it: "*And the Pharisees coming to him asked him: Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him. But he answering said to them: What did Moses command you? who said: Moses permitted to write a bill of divorce, and to put her away. To whom Jesus answering said: Because of the hardness of your heart he wrote you that precept. But from the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female.*" That is, *one* male for *one* female; *one* Adam for *one* Eve.

"*For this cause a man shall leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife. And they shall be in one flesh. Therefore now they are not two but one flesh.*

"*What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.*

"*And in the house again his disciples asked him concerning the same thing. And he saith to them: Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her.*"

"*And if the wife shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.*"

It would be impossible to express more clearly than is done in these words the unity, sanctity, and indissolubility of marriage. By them the Mosaic divorce is abrogated; and its abrogation is twice declared, once in public discourse, and again in private ex-

[1] Judge Story, "Conflict of Laws," section 108, note.

planation by the divine lawgiver to his apostles. The natural contract and ceremony of the Mosaic dispensation are elevated to a higher sphere and made a sacrament, by the divine Author of all the sacraments.

Again, this indissolubility of marriage is inculcated by our Lord, in Luke xvi., verse 18: "*Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and he that marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery.*" The possibility and the right to put away a wife are here expressed; but it is evidently only a divorce *a mensa et thoro*, from bed and board; the *vinculum*, the marriage-tie remains unbroken; for he that marries her who is put away commits adultery, which could not be if she were free, any more than it would be adultery to marry a widow or a widower. There is no exception in either of these texts. They are both absolute and categorical.

The most voluminous and the greatest inspired expounder of our Lord's words is St. Paul. We have the authority of St. Peter indorsing this estimate of the apostle of the Gentiles. Now this is what St. Paul writes about marriage, 1 Cor. vii., verse 39: "*A woman is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband die, she is at liberty: let her marry to whom she will, only in the Lord.*" This is a clear declaration that the consummated marriage of Christians can be dissolved only by the death of one of the married parties; and is the best commentary ever written on the words of Christ: "*They are not two but one flesh,*" "*what therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.*" In the same chapter, verse 10, St. Paul says: "*Not I, but the Lord commandeth that the wife depart not from her husband.*" But if she does depart, being divorced from bed and board on account of adultery, or some equally heinous offence, she must still remain unmarried; for he continues: "*And if she depart,*" the Lord commandeth, "*that she remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband.*"

It is a canon of hermeneutics that the obscure should always be explained by the clear; and if therefore there is any obscurity in the New Testament regarding the doctrine of marriage, these clear texts, some of them, if not all, written later than any obscure passage that may be quoted on the subject, should be the proper interpreters of it. This rule of interpretation is admitted by those even who are not willing to admit the authority of the Christian Fathers, nor the infallible authority of the Catholic Church in interpreting Scripture.

Now it so happens that there are two texts relating to marriage, both in the gospel of St. Matthew, which have given rise to contention; and human passion, rather than the light of faith and authority, has made the sects, in spite of the clear texts above quoted,

choose the sinister rather than the universal Catholic explanation of them.

The first of these texts is Matth. v., verses 31 and 32: "*And it hath been said whosoever shall put away his wife let him give her a bill of divorce.*" Our Lord is correcting the false interpretations which the Pharisees had put on many of the Mosaic laws. He is also improving those laws, abolishing some of them and bringing ethical legislation up to the pure and high standard of his own teaching. The context shows this. He is stating the old Hebrew law, or the pharisaical gloss on it. He does this first, and then corrects the error or abrogates the law. This he has been doing on other points. Then he proceeds to the question of marriage: "*But I say to you,*" not as Moses said to give a bill of divorce, *a vinculo*, which he allowed on account of "*the hardness of your hearts;*" "that *whosoever shall put away his wife excepting for the cause of fornication,*" when it is allowed to put her away from bed and board forever if you like, but not to free her from the sacramental tie, "*maketh her to commit adultery;* and *he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.*" Christ does not say, "Give the woman a bill of divorce as Moses permitted when she commits fornication, so that she may be free." This He would have done if it was His purpose to permit the discarded woman to marry again, as the sects claim. His purpose was to abrogate the Mosaic bill of divorce as the context here, and in Matth. xix., verse 9, shows. That Mosaic bill of divorce was the occasion of our Lord's words. But he does not abrogate the Mosaic bill of divorce, if the words "except the case of fornication" mean the possibility of a divorce, *a vinculo*, and are not confined to a divorce, *a thoro*. If divorce *a vinculo* be allowed by Christ, has he not left the Mosaic law in this matter unchanged? In that case Christians would have the same indulgence as was accorded to the ancient Jews on account "of the hardness of their hearts;" and our Lord's words would imply no modification of the Mosaic laws regarding marriage, and would have no sense; a supposition which would be absurd and blasphemous.

Besides, if a woman who has been discarded on account of adultery may marry again, as some of the sects say, her position would be better than that of one dismissed for no crime at all. The adulteress would be free to marry, while a woman separated from her husband on account of sickness, for instance, could not marry. This would be the necessary consequence of the Protestant interpretation of the text. But it is plain that our Lord frees the husband from the burden of living with the adulteress, but not from the bond of marriage. This is all he concedes, while Moses concedes total divorce on account "*of the hardness of heart*" of the

Jews. "If husbands were allowed by Christ to dismiss their adulterous wives and marry others, men who were tired of their wives would forge charges of adultery against them to get rid of them and marry new ones; and thus our Lord, instead of restricting the discipline of the old law, would have relaxed it."[1] In the old law the adulteress was put to death; in Christ's law, according to Protestant interpretation, she could go free and marry again; while a discarded wife guilty of no crime would not enjoy a similar privilege.

Remark further, the reason why our Lord does not say that if the discarded woman marries again she commits adultery, is because it was unnecessary to say so. She had been discarded for adultery, and it was useless to add that her new offence if she dared to marry again would be adultery. But He says that "*he that shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery*," to show that she could marry no other man, and that no other man could marry her so long as her husband was alive.

An Anglican may say that this argument only shows that the guilty party cannot marry again, something which he admits in common with the Catholic Church; but that it does not prove that the innocent party may not marry again, as he maintains with all Protestants contrary to the teaching of the Catholic Church. To this we answer, 1. That as an innocent man cannot marry the guilty woman who is discarded—the text says it—the innocent is made to suffer in any case; the innocent who may want to marry her as well as the innocent who has been married to her; for the indissoluble tie of marriage is the real reason of her inability for marriage rather than her adultery. 2. Christ distinctly says in Matt. xix., v. 9, "*I say to you that whosoever shall put away his wife except it be for fornication and shall marry another committeth adultery*." Here the innocent man after putting away his wife for adultery is still tied by an indissoluble chain; for the words "*and shall marry another committeth adultery*," follow the words "except it be for fornication," to show that even then the Christian law holds the man in spiritual bondage, contrary to the Hebrew law which gave him carnal liberty. There is, indeed, one privilege given to the innocent by our Lord, and it is a great one: to turn the culprit out of the house, but not to break an indissoluble contract and desecrate a sacrament. 3. The individual must suffer for the good of the whole. Every day individual liberty is abridged by the state for the good of the commonwealth, and so in the Christian commonwealth must the individual bear the sweet yoke of Jesus Christ for the sake of good morals and the sanctity of marriage.

[1] St. Jerome quoted by Maldonatus, "Comment. in Matthaeum," in loco.

Besides, the other texts and arguments clearly exclude even the Anglican exception in favor of divorce.

The full text of Matth. xix., v. 8 and 9, gives new light to this interpretation. It reads: "*Because Moses by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so.*" Our Lord is now going to correct the Mosaic laxity and assert the dignity of the sacrament: "And I say to you that whosoever shall put away his wife except it be for fornication,"—and then a partial divorce is allowed, not a total one as Moses permitted,—"*and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.*" Even after putting her away the man is not free to marry, else why say that even then if he remarries he commits adultery, just as she would? For that which is crime for one is crime for the other according to the text. The husband is not bound to put her away; he may condone the offence; but he has the privilege of dismissing her forever, although he cannot marry again while she lives. That this severe interpretation of the text is the only right one is shown by the context that follows. The Apostles, understanding and realizing that Christ taught that a man once married, to a leper, or a scold, or even to an adulteress, could never be loosed from the sacramental knot save by the death of his wife, said v. 10: "*If the case of a man with his wife be so, it is not expedient to marry.*" If they had understood him as granting license to remarry when a wife was unfaithful, they would not have spoken in this way. If these Christian Hebrews, as the Apostles were, had not understood our Lord as abridging and abolishing the Mosaic privilege of divorce, their words would not be what they were. And our Lord in reply to them, instead of softening his doctrine, tells them in the subsequent verses, that it is better and more conducive to spiritual perfection not to marry than to marry. His religion is a restraint on human passions, an abridgment of the liberty of the flesh, the perfection and purification of the Hebrew creed. And although his teaching regarding the indissolubility of marriage may be a "hard" doctrine, as was said of his doctrine regarding Transubstantiation,[1] He can make no concession. He came to purify morals, not to break down the dykes that hold passions in check.

The impartial reader, we think, will admit that the Catholic interpretation of the above texts is the correct one according to the laws of hermeneutics, even though he may refuse the testimony of the Church in the case. How unfortunate for public morals it is then that the Protestant sects should have permitted passion to

[1] John vi., v. 61. "*Many therefore of his disciples hearing it said: This saying is hard and who can hear it?*"

lead them to interpret the words "*except the case of fornication*," as legitimizing divorce *a vinculo*, whereas they mean only a permission for divorce *a mensa et thoro*, from bed and board. Speaking of sectarian looseness in this matter, Dr. Dix appropriately writes: "This is a heresy born and bred of free thought as applied to religion; it is the outcome of the habit of interpreting the Bible according to a man's private judgment, rejecting ecclesiastical authority and Catholic tradition, and asserting our freedom to believe what we choose, and to select what religion pleases us best."[1] This is very orthodox writing and has the ring of the old Church about it. Dr. Dix is an Anglican. He belongs, we believe, to the High Church party. Now the Anglican Church is one of the most respectable of the sects, and clings still with tenacity to many of the old doctrines and customs of the Catholic Church. The odor of the old faith and of the old piety hangs around Anglicanism, even after the sacred vase of Catholic unity and orthodoxy has been shattered. Dr. Dix is one of the best types of the New York Anglican clergy. Many of them are pious, passably learned, and would make good Catholic priests if God would give them the grace of conversion to the true faith; and if they were not impeded by what the venerable and learned Benedictine, Dr. Bernard Smith,[2] once said in Rome was the chief argument against the Catholic Church, "hanging on their arms." And so Dr. Dix, "orthodox" and well-intentioned gentleman as he is, inveighs against divorce. We follow his song with pleasure. The tones are clear and true, but just when he reaches the "top note" he fails; and the ear is offended by a flat and unnatural discord. "Marriage is not a mere civil contract," he writes, "it is a divine institution." He even calls it a sacrament, quoting Ephes. v. 32, in a foot-note, "*sacramentum hoc magnum est*," with the gloss "the English word 'mystery,' the Latin 'sacramentum,' alike indicate the presence and work of supernatural power and divine grace."[3] Discussing the clause "*except the case of fornication*," he says: "It is not absolutely clear what that word 'fornication' means. It may possibly mean infidelity after marriage, or it may mean impurity before marriage. I cannot discuss the question here. But mark, that is the sole exception; *and it is a mere peradventure that it includes post-nuptial sin*."

Yet on that peradventure, and because of that shadow of doubt, the benefit of the doubt is given[4] by the Anglican Church per-

---

[1] "The Calling of a Christian Woman," p. 135.

[2] "Here," said the Doctor, "comes the Rev. Mr. So-and-So with the chief argument against the Catholic Church hanging on his arm." It was an Episcopalian minister with his wife.

[3] "The Calling," etc., p. 137.

[4] Idem, p. 140.

mitting divorce. "*It is the rule of our own branch of the Church, and we must follow it.* Divorce, with the privilege to remarry, may be granted, but for one only cause: when adultery has been proved."[1] A strange Church that cannot give an authoritative interpretation of an important text of Scripture, but leaves the matter to a mere "*peradventure*," and on that "*peradventure*" tolerates divorce! Yet Dr. Dix does not approve of the practice of his *branch* of the Church in this case. He is a true Protestant still, and although we have already quoted his words condemning private interpretation and free thought, he uses both against his own "*branch*."[2] Hear him: "The stringent rule is this, that though the married may be separated so as to live apart when they cannot live together in peace, yet are they still man and wife; and no new matrimonial relation can be formed. They may come back to each other; to strange flesh they cannot go." This is the doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church. "And *I think that must have been what the Lord meant, and that it ought to be the rule of the Church.*"[3] Here is an opinion by an Anglican clergyman condemning the teaching and practice of his own "*branch*" of the Church, yet asserting that we must follow it for all that. Why not follow the lead of the Holy Ghost instead, and leave a sect which you believe to teach error? Is not that a plain duty of conscience? Is not that what logic would dictate? But alas! logic and Anglicanism were divorced long ago. We pray that it may be only *a mensa et thoro!*

The Anglican *branch* of Protestantism having allowed absolute divorce for cause of adultery, in fact owing its very existence to an English king who divorced his wife and the Catholic Church at the same time, the other "branches" could not be expected to do better. The consequence is that absolute divorces are now common for various causes, and partial divorces from bed and board are hardly understood out of the Catholic Church. The United States, where so many Protestant "branches" exist, and where being in the majority they control civil legislation on the subject, are now morally degraded on account of the facility with which divorces are granted. Let us take a view of some of the laws on the subject in the different States, all admitting divorce. Alabama permits divorce not only for the usual grave causes, but for two years' desertion; Arkansas for habitual drunkenness for a year, or desertion for a year; California for habitual intemperance or wilful neglect of the husband to provide for the wife for two years, or conviction of felony; Connecticut for seven years' absence not heard from; Florida for ungovernable temper and desertion for a year; Illinois for desertion for two years, or "any grounds which the court may consider proper;" Indiana for abandonment for a

[1] "The Calling," p. 141. [2] Idem, p. 140. [3] Idem, p. 140.

year, or for "such other causes as the court in its discretion may deem sufficient;" Kansas for gross neglect of duty; Kentucky for living apart without co-habitation for five years, desertion for a year, confirmed drunkenness of the husband with improvidence continued for a year, habitual misbehavior of the husband continued for six months; Maine at the discretion of the judge; Michigan for desertion for two years; Minnesota for drunkenness for a year; New Jersey for desertion for three years; North Carolina for "any just cause which the Civil court may deem proper;" Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, Tennessee, and elsewhere for desertion for two years. Thus in most of our States a man may run away from his wife when he is tired of her, remain away from her for a few years and then marry another, or he may enjoy this privilege as a reward of misbehavior for six months.[1] To this degree of degradation has the teaching of the Protestant reformation brought the holy institution of Christian marriage. When will the conservative thinkers in the sects and out of them do justice to the Catholic Church on this important matter? Do they not see that she alone, by her unflinching and unyielding position in regard to the sanctity and indissolubility of the marriage relation, is the only breakwater to the advancing tides of social immorality in our country? We therefore invite them all to come into the ark out of the deluge; to come on to the Catholic platform, which never breaks down, for its planks were laid and its props fashioned by the omnipotent hand of the Divine Workman. The superiority of the sanction which the Catholic Church gives to domestic society, and her protection of the holy sacrament of matrimony are further evidenced in the number and character of the impediments with which she has hedged it in. The Hebrew prohibitions of marriage as found in the book of Leviticus are in many respects different from those of the Catholic Church. The Hebrew law was a national dispensation and narrow in its import. There was in it the obligation of keeping the tribes distinct from one another, and of confining the royal descent and the priesthood to special families. Hence, certain consanguineous marriages and marriages of affinity not permitted by the Church, were not only allowed, but commanded, by the law of Moses. The Catholic Church having abolished carnalism and enlarged the limits of charity by inculcating the doctrine of the

[1] The rasping lines of the Roman satirist will soon apply to the condition of our much-divorced people:

> "Cur desiderio Bibulæ Sertorius ardet?
> Si verum excutias, *facies*, *non uxor* amatur.
> Tres rugæ subeant, et se cutis arida laxet,
> Fiant obscuri dentes oculique minores;
> Collige sarcinulas, dicet libertas, et exi:
> Jam gravis es nobis et sæpe emungeris, exi
> Ocius et propera: sicco venit altera naso."
>
> —*Juvenal, Sat.* vi., v. 142, *seq.*

universal brotherhood of man through the Incarnation, set her face from the first against the intermarriage of relatives, among other reasons for the purpose of widening the relationship of the family, and destroying selfishness, which is the foe of Christian charity. Science and good social policy approve the action of the Church in this matter. They show that the marriage of blood relatives imperils the increase of population, and is injurious both to the physical and mental health of the race. A nation's glory is not its material wealth, but the strong arms of a healthy manhood; and this incestuous marriages destroy:

> "A bold peasantry, its country's pride,
> When once destroyed can never be supplied."

A people to be brave must also be healthy; and therefore the quotation from Goldsmith may be appropriately supplemented by the line of Juvenal: "*Orandum est, ut sit mens sana in corpore sano.*"[1] Incestuous marriages unite affections that should be kept separate. The affection which a man has for his kin should not be confounded with that which he should have for his wife. They should be kept specifically distinct, for they are often incompatible; as, for instance, if a woman were a man's wife and niece at the same time, by the former title being his equal, by the latter his inferior. They often engender fratricidal strife; for in case of conflict between husband and wife, it is bad enough to see their respective families take sides in the quarrel like so many Montagues and Capulets, but worse when the combatants are all of the same flesh and blood. Such marriages confuse the ties of kindred and complicate indefinitely relationships. But above all, they increase the temptations to vice, and sully the sources of family love. There is one spot where it should not be possible for the demon of lust ever to enter. It is home. Its sacred door should be closed to black-winged concupiscence. The halo of purity that surrounds the angel forms of sister, aunt, niece, and even cousins, who are like to sisters, with whom we have culled the flowers in May by the hedgerows and in the meadows, or with whom we have whiled away the long hours of the winter in intimate and innocent amusement, must ever shine with untarnished lustre. Even the greetings or caresses of our own blood must be shielded from evil thoughts or foul blight; and therefore around the home, the Catholic Church throws the white mantle of her holiness; and by her stern impediments exorcises the fiend that would destroy the reverence and respect due by the law of nature to our kindred. Within the home she lights

[1] The law of man's physical life is like that of other animals. The race is injured unless foreign stock and new blood are frequently crossed with the original source. Every physiologist knows this. The reader can find this law well explained in "Peace through the Truth," an able work by Rev. T. Harper, S. J.

a vestal fire that ever burns, and is never dimmed by the smoke of passion. She extends her prohibition even to affinity. She does not wish to see the anomaly of the aunt of children becoming one day their mother. She protects the wife and the husband from the danger which may most threaten them. She will not suffer the sick or aged wife to run the risk of being supplanted in her husband's affections by her younger sister, or niece, or cousin, who is privileged by relationship to live on terms of intimacy in her home. The broad law of reverence for the sacrament of marriage pervades all the Church's impediments both of consanguinity and affinity.

And here again, we have to call attention to the anomalous and illogical position of Anglicanism in regard to the Levitical impediments. By examining the Anglican table of prohibited degrees, we find that it is not forbidden for a half-brother to marry his half-sister; although Leviticus xviii., v. 9, prohibits such marriage. Why this unscriptural omission by so "scriptural" a Church?[1] In the Levitical catalogue there are twenty-two prohibitions; in the Anglical catalogue there are sixty. Then there are thirty-eight Anglican prohibitions of marriage for which there is no Bible warrant. Why this unscriptural assumption in so "scriptural" a "*branch?*" The conduct of this church in regard to one impediment of affinity, viz., the marrying a deceased wife's sister, is at the present time exceedingly amusing. The impediment exists, but the Church of England has not the power of dispensing in it. A strange Church that makes a law but requires an act of Parliament to unmake it! In this matter she is like a man who uses a ladder to climb, kicks the ladder away by mistake, and then has no means of coming down. Yet Henry VIII., her founder, used just such a dispensation from Rome to marry Catharine, his brother's widow. The intermarriage of cousins is not prohibited by Protestantism, and consequently it fails to guard domestic purity.

We shall briefly state the impediments of marriage according to the discipline of the Catholic Church. They are twofold, those which simply impede so as to render the contract illicit but not invalid; and those which impede so as to render it null and void. A special prohibition as to time, place, or person, or an injunction to comply with certain formalities; thus to marry a Protestant, to marry without publication of banns, would render a marriage illicit and sinful but not necessarily invalid. Care should be taken not to confound the Church's *impedimenta impedientia*, with what are called "voidable" contracts in the civil law. A marriage which is merely illegal in the eyes of the Church is sinful, but not "voidable." The sin may be wiped out by contrition and sacramental confession; but the marriage cannot be annulled even by the Pope,

[1] "Peace through the Truth," Appendix D., p. 673.

unless the impediment is *dirimens*, or one that invalidates the contract.

The invalidating impediments are numerous. Some of the *impedimenta impedientia* merge into *dirimentia*. Thus, "*pre-contract*," as Blackstone calls "*sponsalia*," although an *impedimentum impediens*, becomes *dirimens* under the name of *public decency*.[1] By a decree of the Council of Trent, pre-contract or "betrothal" annuls marriage in the first degree of consanguinity only. Again, the clandestine marriage of a Catholic to a Protestant, which is only an impeding impediment in most parts of the United States, merges into an annulling impediment wherever the decree made by the Council of Trent against clandestine marriages has been promulgated. This decree annuls all marriages not made in presence of the parish priest or his substitute and two witnesses.[2]

As marriage is a sacrament, though having the nature of a contract, the Catholic Church claims exclusive control over it, and permits the State to legislate only regarding its civil effects. If the State does more than this, the Church considers it an intrusion, which she out of charity or courtesy may tolerate, provided the State law does not interfere with the matter, the form, or the ministers of the sacrament. The matter is the consent of the parties delivering over to each other a right to each other's body; the form is the consent formally expressed by words or other signs in the actual delivery of this right; and the ministers of the sacrament are the contracting parties themselves, the priest being only the minister of the Church. She will never recognize the doctrine that the State can make a law annulling the marriage contract between Christians. In this matter she claims absolute and exclusive jurisdiction, limited only by the divine and the natural law. In regard to these diriment impediments the words of Blackstone are appropriate: "These disabilities make the contract void *ab initio*, and not merely voidable; not that they dissolve a contract already formed, but they render the parties incapable of performing any contract at all; they do not put asunder those who are joined together, but they previously hinder the junction, and, if any persons under these legal incapacities come together, it is a meretricious and not a matrimonial union."[3]

Some of these "disabilities," as laid down in canon law, are as follows: solemn vows and holy orders. The marriage of nuns and monks or of sub-deacons, deacons, priests or bishops, is null and void. Consanguinity, in the collateral line, annuls to the fourth degree inclusive; thus the marriage of cousins is null and void. The disability of relatives in the direct line as to marriage

[1] "Honestas publica."

[2] Sess. 24, c. 3.

[3] Blackstone's Commentaries, book 1, chap. xv.

is unlimited. Those spiritually related cannot marry. The marriage of godfather or godmother with a godchild or its parents is void, as is the marriage of baptizer to baptized, or to the baptized's parents. The same law holds good for those acting as godparents in confirmation, and to the same extent as in the case of baptism.

Adoption is another annulling impediment. The adopter cannot marry the adopted child or its children; nor can the adopted marry the children of the adopter, nor the widow of the adopter; nor can the adopter marry the widow of the adopted.

Affinity arising from a legitimate marriage is an annulling impediment, and, like consanguinity in the collateral line, extends to the fourth degree inclusive. If it arise from an illicit connection it extends only to the second degree. No man can marry his wife's sister or her niece.

Adultery committed with a promise of marriage renders the marriage void. Nor can a man who has murdered his wife marry a woman who has been his accomplice in the act, and *vice versa*.

The marriage of an unbaptized person with one that is baptized is invalid.[1]

The reason of this impediment is evident. The Catholic Church loves the souls of her children too well to permit them to run the risk of losing their faith, or of bringing up children without it; and consequently, if possible, she will grant no dispensation to marry an unbeliever, unbaptized or even baptized, unless the faith of the Catholic party and of the offspring, should there be any, be secured from molestation. The words of Pope Benedict XIV.,[2] applied to mixed marriages, or marriages between Catholics and baptized Protestants, apply with greater force to those between Catholics and infidels. They are "detestable, and our holy mother the Church has always condemned and forbidden them."

Forced fear, such as to destroy freedom of consent, and rape or forcible abduction, nullify marriage, as does also physical impotency. A very remarkable instance of fear and force nullifying marriage has occurred, during the reign of Leo XIII., in the case of the Prince Albert of Monaco and Mary, the daughter of the Duchess of Hamilton. The lady sued for divorce on the ground of fear and force destroying her consent, and in the trial it was shown that her mother had entreated and morally forced her to marry the Prince against her will, and that she had refused to live with him. Two ecclesiastical commissions appointed by His Holi-

[1] For the question of the marriage of unbaptized persons and what is to be done in case of their baptism if they have several wives, which one is to be retained as legitimate, etc., see Ballerini's note to "Gury," p. 736.

[2] Bull *Matrimonia* of Nov. 4, A.D. 1741.

ness tried the case, and pronounced the marriage null, the one on May 17, 1879, the other on January 3, 1880. The Pope then took the case into his own hands, and, after a thorough examination, declared that the marriage was invalid, though the child born of it was to be considered legitimate.[1]

The marriage of females before twelve and of males before fourteen years full is also generally invalid.

These are some of the chief impediments. The reader will not expect us to discuss them at length. The Catholic reader will pardon us for telling him what he already knows; but the Protestant inquirer will perhaps thank us for saving him the trouble of reading our text-book of theology for the information which we give him.

If these impediments be examined closely it will be found that motives of sound public policy and supernatural wisdom have dictated their enactment. We have already pointed out some of the reasons which justify the impediments of consanguinity and affinity. The same reasons apply to the case of adopted children and god-parents. The relations between such parties are too close not to be fenced off by impediments which are the sentinels of purity. The impediments of forced fear and abduction protect the liberty of consent necessary for marriage according to the axiom, "*Non concubitus sed consensus facit matrimonium.*"

But are there not cases where public policy or private justice would prompt a departure from the general laws regulating these impediments and render a dispensation not only useful but even necessary? May there not sometimes be a wrong that can be righted, or a sacred duty that can be fulfilled only by removing the barrier of a matrimonial disability? And is there no power on earth competent to do it? Yes; the Catholic Church has the dispensing power, and she exercises it through her head, the Pope, or his appointed delegate. We have already mentioned the case of fear nullifying the Prince of Monaco's marriage. The true Church is not like the Anglican Church, which needs the permission of a political parliament to remove an impediment which she herself has made. Most of the impediments above enumerated are of purely ecclesiastical origin. The Church made them. The Church for good reasons can unmake them. The vicar of Christ, the successor of St. Peter, who holds the keys of apostolic power to bind or loose according to the commission given to him as infallible teacher and supreme legislator for God's people, uses the dispensing power whenever the good of society, or of religion, or the eternal salvation of souls may require it. That he, as the chief spiritual authority in Christendom, should have this power is im-

[1] See the case in full in the "*Acta Sanctæ Sedis*," vol. xii., p. 403.

plicitly though unintentionally conceded in these words of Blackstone: "The punishment therefore or annulling of incestuous or other unscriptural marriages is the province of the spiritual courts, which act *pro salute animarum*."[1]

The power to annul is correlative with the power to dispense. Unfortunately, however, some of the civil powers have not been willing to leave marriage to the jurisdiction of the Church; considering it as a mere profane contract, they have loosened its bond and destroyed the whole order of society, as the condition of those countries—of France, for instance—proves where the sacramental character of marriage has been ignored. There is no remedy for this perturbation of the moral order but a return to the doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church. She teaches that marriage is a holy sacrament, and that the Christian family, of which it is the corner-stone, has its prototype in the Holy Trinity itself. Just as in the divine family there are three in one, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, bound together by eternal and indissoluble love, so in the human family there are the husband, wife and child bound together by mutual and indissoluble love. She points to the holy family at Nazareth, in which Joseph, Mary and the divine Jesus live as the model of every Christian family. She teaches, with St. Paul, that "this is a great sacrament, . . . in Christ and in the Church."[2] As Christ had two natures united in one person, so in marriage there are two persons in one flesh, but considered as only one moral person. Christ is the head of the Church; the husband is the head of the family. The Church is Christ's spouse, whom he nourishes with infallible doctrine and vivifies with his perpetual presence, which fructifies and fecundates, producing children of God and heirs of heaven; as the husband in the sacrament of marriage protects and supports the partner of his bosom and brings up children in the order of nature to be raised by the grace of baptism to the supernatural order.[3] Christ has promised to remain with his Church all days, even to the consummation of the world; and the Christian husband and wife in the sacrament of marriage pledge fidelity to each other to the end of their lives. Christ in the Church deserts the soul that sins mortally, but His

---

[1] Commentaries, edition of Banks & Bro., New York, 1878, p. 142.

[2] Ephes. v., verse 32.

[3] "Adam was a type of Christ; Eve a type of the Church. As from Adam and his spouse the whole human race sprang, so from Christ and his Church the whole multitude of believers was generated. . . . . The first man and the first prophet—Adam—prophesied this of Christ and the Church; that our Lord and Saviour would leave his Father God and his mother, the heavenly Jerusalem, and would come down to earth for the sake of his spouse the Church, whom he formed out of his side, and for whom the Word was made flesh."—St. Jerome, "Com. in Epist. ad Ephes.," lib. ii., c. 5, v. 31.

sufficient grace deserts no man, and the stamp of baptism always remains. The repentant sinner is always welcome to His divine arms. There has been, as it were, a partial divorce between him and his Redeemer; something like the divorce from bed and board which may take place among married Christians. The blessing of Christ is on the married couple from the beginning; the ring that symbolizes their union is blessed, and abundant graces are showered on them through the sacrament, enabling them to bring up their children in the fear and love of God. This is the only doctrine that will sanctify the family and save the State; and this is the doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church alone.

THE CHURCH OF FRANCE AND THE REVOLUTION.

The Gallican Church; a History of the Church of France from the Concordat of Bologna, 1516, to the Revolution. W. Henley Jervis, Canon, etc. London, Murray, 2 vols., 8vo., 1882.

History of France. W. H. Jervis. London, Murray, 1882.

State of Society in France before the Revolution and the Causes that Led to that Event. De A. Tocqueville; translated by Henry Reese. London, Murray, 1882.

Les Origines de la France Contemporaine. H. Taine. Paris, Calmann Levy, 1880, 2 vols.

The French Revolution. H. Taine. London, Daldy & Co., 1881, 3 vols.

"THE history of the Papacy is the martyrology of nations!" exclaimed the Abbé Grégoire, in one of his petulant diatribes against the authority of the Holy See. The definition would have been more just and accurate had he put it thus: "The history of nations is the martyrology of the Papacy."

The one has, in truth, been so bound up with the other that the narrative of the world's wars and revolutions, its struggles and triumphs, the rise and progress and decay of its dynasties, from the Christian era to our own time, might be written as a running corollary on the margin of the history of the Papacy. The destinies of both have been so closely interwoven that the records of the one cannot be fully written without including the records of the other, and nowhere has this solidarity been so strikingly exempli-

fied as in the annals of the nation that long gloried in the title of "eldest daughter of the Church." France, above every other country, for centuries so identified her interests with those of Christianity, that her very existence came to depend in a measure on the maintenance of this union, and, therefore, it followed that whenever she fell out with the Church the disagreement partook of the nature of a conjugal quarrel, bitter, personal, ending in that rancorous hatred which comes with the violent rupture of a sacred natural bond. Her quarrels with the Church have invariably turned to direct rebellion against God, to defiant upheaving against His law, and a satanic effort to break and abolish His authority.

The Revolution opened its campaign by a legitimate charge against the higher clergy; but this specious pretext soon proved to be a mere feint and the starting-point of a fierce and wholesale attack upon religion itself, which was speedily to culminate in the savage slaughter of numbers amongst that section of the clergy against whom the reformers avowedly had no grievance, a crime which in its turn was the prelude to an act of blasphemy unparalleled in the history of peoples. When the Convention passed a decree denying the existence of "one named God," the Revolution reached that point where its excesses recoiled upon itself.

Mr. Jervis, in the preface of his remarkable work on the Revolution and the Church,[1] boldly challenges M. Thiers's assertion that the National Assembly aimed only at reforming abuses, that it made no aggression upon the spiritual or ecclesiastical power, but confined its action to legislating for temporal reforms. This misrepresentation was sedulously propagated by the would-be reformers of the time, and has been maintained ever since by the apologists of the Revolution, who fail to perceive that the Assembly of '89 began by assailing the relations of the Church with the State, and attacking points of doctrine, thus provoking the schism that sundered the Church of France at that period, and has remained an ill-closed wound up to our own day.

Mirabeau, more honest, or, at any rate, more clearsighted than the rest of his colleagues, bluntly told them that "if they wished to have a revolution they must begin by decatholicizing France."

This work of decatholicization was, according to Mr. Jervis, begun by, or, at any rate, within the Church herself. It strikes us that he very much exaggerates the importance of the incident on which he lays his heavy charge, namely, the petition of the lower clergy for the redress of some of their grievances against the higher. The clergy of all ranks had a perfect right to petition the crown, its relations with the Church being what they were at that period, filial, friendly, and chivalrous. The curés were conse-

[1] The Gallican Church and the Revolution. (Kegan Paul.)

quently guilty of no disloyal act when they appealed to the king to alleviate the unjust and vexatious burdens which pressed upon them. They had a right to petition the crown for redress against the temporal irregularities imposed upon them by those prelates and abbots whose wealth and luxury had become a scandal to the faithful, whose large emoluments, drawn for the most part from sinecures, were a crying injustice which weighed heavily on the zealous, overworked, and ill-paid priesthood. That the coincidence of this appeal with the first mutterings of the Revolution was in itself unfortunate and may have been ill-advised, we are ready to admit, but we cannot accept that it sounded the signal and led the way to that attack upon the Church of France which ended in its overthrow. The breach between the higher and the lower clergy was no doubt doubly to be regretted at a crisis when the ancient order of things, ecclesiastical and civil, was about to stand its trial before the nation; but, deeper down than this misunderstanding, there were causes within the Church of France which were imperilling its very existence. Foremost amongst these was Jansenism, an organic disease which had long been a dissolving agency at work enfeebling and dividing it. From a mere theological controversy, Jansenism had worked its way into the domain of politics and was now a distinct element in the approaching Revolution, though a far less powerful element than Protestant historians are apt to suppose. The Jansenists had been crushed under the two preceding reigns, but they had not been killed or extinguished even by the Bull *Unigenitus;* they were still a faction, a smouldering fire, ready to be fanned into a flame by the first blast of the Revolution. The moment it broke out they threw themselves into it with passionate enthusiasm. Their influence, however, at this crisis has been considerably overrated. Even had they risen above sectarian ambitions and revenges, and sacrificed their personal cause to the interest of the Church, they were not powerful enough to arrest the onset of the Revolution and its ruinous results. The heart of the nation never went over to the Jansenists; their doctrines had never become "popular." Then, as now, the nation was divided, roughly speaking, into two classes, orthodox Catholics and unbelievers. Jansenism was not indigenous to the soil; it was an imported growth that flourished only within a certain radius and under conditions that were not indigenous. The fact, nevertheless, remains, that the Jansenists were a power in the National Assembly, and that they lent a strong hand to the ruin of the Church by throwing their weight on the side of the Left, composed chiefly then, as in the Chamber of to-day, of atheists, fanatics, and adventurers, including *ninety-nine degraded priests.* The rôle of the Jansenists under the Revolution was precisely that

which is being enacted in the present day by a handful of *prêtres défroqués* in France, in Germany, and in Switzerland. The groups of ecclesiastical *révoltés* in league with the Jacobins of '93 has its prototype in every age; it is always the same type, the same secret springs setting in motion the same machinery. Men who, finding the yoke of the perfect life intolerable to their hungry, rebellious passions, break loose from it and pair with the enemies of the Church in representing that yoke as odious, dangerous, and contemptible, and in vilifying the ideal they have betrayed; Doms Gerles, who first dishonor and cast off their monastic habit, and then join with the Jacobins of the day in attacking the doctrine and discipline of the Church, trading on the ignorance and the prejudices of those who hate her, sowing discord amongst souls, and making capital out of their knowledge of sacred science and their familiarity with sacred subjects.

Like all factions in white heat of rebellion, the Jansenists were to a great extent blind to the ultimate issue of the onset in which they joined; but the leaders of that onset had a perfectly clear view of their purpose, which was to deprive the Church of her temporal pre-eminence, to humiliate and bring her into bondage to the State, and thus more effectually to attack her essential power and uproot that indigenous plant of Catholicity which the Revolution of all periods has rightly enough regarded as the greatest obstacle in its path. The Assembly, however, was too clearsighted to proclaim openly this clause in its programme. It knew well that, for all their outcry against the higher clergy and the feudal system still in force in their temporal estate, the mass of the people were at heart loyal to the Church, and that any direct attack upon her would alarm the national susceptibilities and throw national sympathy on the other side. It therefore went cautiously to work, keeping its batteries covered until the moment should arrive for unmasking them with safety and effect. This opportunity came in the form of an ecclesiastical committee, which was appointed for the purpose of redressing the grievances of the inferior clergy and reforming the organization of the Church generally.

The leading spirits of this committee were Treilhard, a barrister and a Jansenist; Camus, the bitterest of Jansenist leaders; the Abbé Grégoire, curé of a parish in Lorraine, a man of unimpeachable integrity in private life, but of more than doubtful orthodoxy. The Assembly named some men, such as Bishop Borel, by way of a blind to public opinion, but the presence of the three first-named sufficiently proved what the drift and aim of the committee was intended to be. The members themselves were not in accord; they started from different points and had different goals in view; they were consequently not qualified to work in harmony or op-

pose a firm and united front to the attack which was advancing with the formidable strength of union.

But however much the committee lacked in the main this force of united action, it was fully united on one point, which was to strike at the authority of the Holy See by establishing the independence of the Gallican Church. It started by demanding the restriction of the Papal prerogative of instituting bishops, a prerogative which dated, not, as is often erroneously supposed, from the Concordat of 1516, but from the earliest days of the Church. The right of institution always belonged to the Pope, the only difference being that in primitive times the bishops were elected by the faithful, and later on by the chapters, until in 1516 the right of presenting the bishops for institution was ceded by the chapters to the sovereign, and secured to him by the Concordat passed between Leo X. and Francis I.

Another hostile step of the committee was the attempt to raise the position of the lower clergy at the expense of that of the higher, demanding that the bishops, abbots, etc., should be reduced to an inferior social standing by being deprived of their revenues and those vast endowments which dated from mediæval times.

The fact that abuses existed is undeniable; the need for some reform was manifest; but when historians assert that this need was among the main causes, some go so far as to say the chief factor in the Revolution, they lay themselves open to the charge of gross exaggeration and historical inaccuracy. M. de Tocqueville, an authorized witness quoted by Mr. Jervis, declares as the result of his own patient and searching investigations, that "there never was a body of clergy in the world more remarkable than the Catholic clergy of France at the moment when they were surprised by the Revolution," and he adds that, after entering on the study of the subject full of prejudices, he left it off full of respect.

The committee had not been many months in operation, when the Assembly, emboldened by the hostility excited in the public mind against the Church by that party whose interest it was to inflame it, gave expression to its own animosity by a series of decrees which no longer left any doubt as to its veritable aim. The proletarian revolt of August was followed by a vote of confiscation of the feudal privileges of the higher clergy, and soon after this the proposed Declaration of the Rights of Man gave rise to a debate as to whether or not the document should begin by any recognition of the Providence of God. This trumpet call at least gave forth no uncertain sound. The clergy, thoroughly alarmed, rose to the defence in the Assembly. The Abbé Grégoire declared that to omit such a recognition would be to expose France to the reprobation of civilized Europe. The phrase was eventually adopted, but the

discussion marked a new date in the attitude and tone of the Assembly. From this time forth, a great change was visible, outbreaks of democratic violence became frequent, and were characterized on the part of the popular leaders by a determination to bring the Church and the clergy into odium. The clerical deputies were insulted on their way to the Assembly, and the Abbé Grégoire complained from the tribune that the curés who were the first to prove their disinterested desire for reforms, by abandoning the titles and supporting the law for the abolition of plurality of benefices, "were day after day outraged by the populace in the streets of Paris." But this protest was drowned in the roar of the battle, which had begun in terrible earnest. The house was now at open war with the Church. The priests were panic-stricken. Many sought safety betimes in flight, seeing that the tide was rising and flight would soon become impossible.

Amongst the crowd of maniacs and mediocrities who held the stage of the Revolution at this period, the figure of Talleyrand stands out like the hero in some sanguinary and brutal romance, a distinct and picturesque individuality, a man nobly born and allied to the oldest houses in France, possessed of large wealth and enjoying a high position in the Church, into which he had been forced without the shadow of vocation. The venerable Abbé Devoucoux, vicar of Autun, Talleyrand's future See, relates how he had heard his brother priests of St. Sulpice speak with anguish of having had to take a part in the ordination of the young nobleman. "We have often heard eye-witnesses declare," he says, "that it was a source of harrowing torture to the director of St. Sulpice, to whom fell the mission, of preparing the heart of the Abbé Talleyrand for the awful ministry that he was assuming, without apparently attaching any particular importance to it." The highest offices and emoluments were at once given to this unlikely minister of the gospel, who as Bishop of Autun stood forward in the Assembly to vilify and despoil his own order and reduce them to the condition of State menials. But Talleyrand possessed that supreme instinct of the politician which taught him to detect, with prophetic certainty, the issue of the rising storm and of changes yet undeveloped. He saw how the fight was going and where his best interests lay, and he made it unhesitatingly his goal, careless of principle, of every consideration but personal gain. The Revolution seized on him as an invaluable instrument. His position, his birth and fortune, his brilliant art and acquirements gave an air of entire disinterestedness, almost of heroism, to his rebellion against a régime which favored him so abundantly, and lent a weight to his utterances quite apart from their real value.

When the debate on Mirabeau's motion for disendowment

came on, in October, 1789, Talleyrand was one of its most ardent and powerful supporters.

Camus, the Jansenist, stood forward, on the other hand, to defend the beleaguered clergy, and his defence was followed by an eloquent and telling speech from the Abbé Maury, their accredited champion. "Our possessions guarantee yours," he said. "We are attacked to-day, but if we are victimized now, it will not be long before you become the prey of the spoiler." Pending the decree for the confiscation of Church property, the Assembly dealt a heavy blow at the liberty of the Church. One week after this stormy debate, the abolition of religious vows in convents of both sexes was proposed, and, contrary to rule and precedent, carried at the same sitting.

The week after this, a mob of armed miscreants surrounded the Archbishop's palace and gave the hesitating legislators within to understand that they were expected to proceed to the business of spoliation without further delay. This act of terrorism, backed by Mirabeau's clever tactics and weight in the Assembly, had the desired effect. The public vote of confiscation of Church property was passed. Well might the Abbé Maury cry out in despair, "There is truly no despotism so terrible as that which puts on the mask of liberty."

Treilhard, who was working actively in the Ecclesiastical Commission, pushed on his advantage by proposing that convents and monasteries should be suppressed in all the larger towns, and only allowed to stand in villages or remote places where they were of use to the population, whereas the revenues of those in towns would be more useful to the State by helping to shake off the spectre of bankruptcy to which Mirabeau pointed in his memorable speech. The final debate on the disposal of ecclesiastical property gave rise, however, to an incident which showed that the full and true animus of the majority was directed not against the wealth of the clergy, or the abuses which had grown out of it, but against religion itself.

Dom Gerle, a member of the Ecclesiastical Committee, rose before the Assembly and, with a view to clearing the committee of the charge of an anti-religious aim and spirit, demanded in its name that a decree be passed to the effect that the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion is and ever will remain the religion of the nation.

The motion was applauded frantically by the Right, whilst the Left clamored for an adjournment, which was finally carried amidst indescribable violence and confusion. The two camps spent the night making ready for the battle of the morrow, which, it was felt, would be a decisive one. The Left assembled at the Jacobin Club

in the Rue St. Honoré, while the Right met in a great hall on the opposite side of the street, and arranged their programme, confident of a great victory. "This time they cannot escape us," said the Abbé Maury; "this motion is a match lighted under a barrel of gunpowder." Meanwhile, the man who had struck the match was being sharply taken to task at the Jacobin meeting, where his motion was censured as stupid and dangerous. Dom Gerle was an ex-Carthusian monk, one of those ninety-nine corrupt and degraded priests who swelled the Jacobin ranks in the Assembly.

The sitting of the next day was stormy, but, after several hours' wrangling, the order of the day was carried without a vote being taken on the motion. The victory, nevertheless, remained with the Jacobins. The nation tacitly refused to proclaim itself Catholic, consequently an open breach had been made between it and the Church, and the faction which had determined on her ruin was henceforth dominant. The Catholics now fully realized the perils of their position and the fate which was in store for the Church at the hands of the Revolution. Thousands throughout the country made enthusiastic demonstrations of their attachment to the faith, and meetings were held in all the large cities. As a natural result of this excitement, collisions took place between the civil and military authorities, and murder, pillage and sacrilege prevailed in many districts for weeks together. At last martial law was proclaimed.

The Assembly was alarmed at the extent of the conflagration it had lighted, and the Ecclesiastical Committee saw that some measures must be found for arresting it before the whole country blazed into civil war. The spoliation of the clergy had thrown them on the world without a career, and, in the great majority of cases, without a livelihood; their position as the first of the three estates of the realm was abolished; the Assembly had reduced them from the condition of independent proprietors to that of state functionaries, and it now became incumbent on it to regulate their situation in accordance with the new organization, and to frame an entirely new system. Camus supplied this demand by bringing forward his famous *Constitution Civile du Clergé*, a scheme which was destined to become the most terrible agent of crime and misery in the wide programme of the Revolution. The adoption of the *Constitution Civile*, in fact, inaugurated the real Reign of Terror, to which the disendowment of the Church and the disorder and dismay caused by that measure, had been only a prelude. The Assembly, without the smallest reference to the Holy See, proceeded to legislate for the Church with a high-handed insolence that was no longer restrained by any authority, divine or human. Fifty bishops were suppressed at one blow, the boundaries of dioceses and

parishes were abolished. The entire ecclesiastical organization was broken up. Bishops were henceforth to be elected by the people *without reference to Rome*. Things were, said the Assembly, to be remodelled on the Church of primitive apostolic times. Camus and Treilhard discoursed, with the assurance of orthodox theologians, on the doctrine and discipline of this Church of their imaginations, bewailed the lamentable abuses which had grown up out of the abandonment of apostolic customs, and discussed the reforms that were to be effected in the Church of France. This eventful debate was one of those farcical touches that every now and then gleam like a ghastly joke on the blood-red tragedy which was in process of enactment. The spectacle of these improvised politicians setting up for divines, quoting the Fathers, laying down the law concerning things spiritual and ecclesiastical, contending for the bringing back of the Church of Christ to the austere simplicity of the apostolic discipline must have raised many a laugh, provoked many a scathing sarcasm from the wits of the Right, while inflicting many a pang too deep to find utterance in satire.

The chief aim of the Civil Constitution, as is apparent at the first glance, was to destroy the authority of the Holy See and sever the Church of France from its guidance and jurisdiction. The bishops elected by the clergy were not even to be allowed "to address themselves to the Bishop of Rome to obtain from him any confirmation." They were to owe their institution solely to the metropolitan, who in his turn was to be controlled by his clergy, and not permitted to refuse institution without having their sanction for so doing.

"It was mere sophistry, it was simply disingenuous," says Mr. Jervis, "to pretend that changes such as these were mere external details, which the civil power had a right to regulate at its pleasure. Rightly or wrongly, the vast majority of Catholics were convinced that spiritual authority, spiritual jurisdiction, spiritual mission, reside in the person and office of the Pope. In their view this was a primary article of faith; and none knew better than the Ecclesiastical Commissioners that, in attempting to abolish that belief, they were doing what must deeply wound the consciences, not only of the bishops and the clergy, but of all the more religiously minded laity throughout France. *But it was precisely in this point that they resolved to take summary and signal vengeance for the "Unigenitus" and all the miseries which had resulted from it for seventy years past.*"

The concluding passage, which we have italicized, contains one of those verdicts which historians of a certain school are prone to deliver on ecclesiastical enactments; but in Mr. Jervis's case his habitual capacity and rectitude of judgment make this erroneous

estimate concerning the *Unigenitus* and its consequences surprising. Indeed, it is hard to believe that Mr. Jervis is quite serious when he credits the uproarious Revolutionary Parliament, intent first on upsetting and then on obliterating every vestige of spiritual authority in the kingdom, with troubling itself about an old theological dispute, and making haste "to take signal and summary vengeance" on behalf of the discomfited Jansenists of seventy years before. The zeal of the Assembly was turned in another direction. True, it allowed, as we have seen, the Jansenist element, strong at that period amongst the lawyers, to enter largely in that mock tribunal entitled the *Comité Ecclesiastique*, but was not this rather because Camus and Treilhard were to the fore as obvious instruments, eager to do the work in hand and serve the Revolution by their hatred to the Church? It was not that the Revolution hated the Jansenists less, but that it hated still more the Church of Rome, whose bitter enemies they were, and it surmised shrewdly enough that to aid and employ those who aimed at separating France from the spiritual jurisdiction of Rome, was a sure and short way towards stamping religion out of the country altogether. If Mr. Jervis were to represent the suppression of the Jesuits by the Parliament of 1762 as an act of vengeance brought about by the Jansenists of that day, there might be some show of reason for the assertion; but to represent the Civil Constitution of the Revolutionary Parliament of 1790 as a tit-for-tat at the *Unigenitus*, is to commit himself to an argument which is refuted by its own absurdity. The bull *Unigenitus* was not the triumph of Jesuitical, but of Catholic doctrine, the doctrine which had never changed, but had been taught by the Church from the beginning. Jansenism was, in reality, a form of the old Novatian heresy, presented in a modern dress to the Pharisees of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and it had been tormenting the Church of France for sixty years before the Holy See formally condemned it. Amongst those who, with Louis XIV. and the Jesuits, had been earnest in demanding that condemnation, were St. Vincent de Paul, M. Olier and the community of St. Sulpice, Bossuet and the doctors of the Sorbonne, Cardinal de Bérulle, etc., in a word all that was most eminent in the Church of France for piety and learning.

The bull *Unigenitus*, which condemned the heresies of Port Royal concerning grace, sin and justification, in no way threatened or entrenched upon the liberties of the Gallican Church; but it was the policy of the Jansenists to pretend that it did, and to set themselves up as the champions of those imperilled liberties. It was in this character that they stood forward in the Assembly. They aimed at breaking up the entire ecclesiastical constitution,

and establishing in its place a "National" Church. The very name witnesses to the fallacy of the idea. A national church is as great an impossibility as a national sun. As God hung the sun in the material heavens that its beams might lighten the whole world, so did He place the Church in the spiritual heavens that it might shine equally to all the nations, irrespective of races, nationalities or governments. The Church can be neither national, nor royal, nor imperial, because Christ made her catholic and universal.

It was at this character of divine and universal supremacy that the Jacobins attempted to strike, when they decreed the sundering of the hierarchy from its dependence on the Holy See. The prelates and Catholic deputies denied, and many of them eloquently disproved, the right of the Assembly to lay hands on these spiritual relations, for it was mere paltry and transparent hypocrisy to pretend that they were not touching the spiritual, while thus tampering with the temporal jurisdiction of the Holy See. The destruction of the former was what they aimed at in attacking the latter. The point at issue was not how many bishops there should be and who should consecrate them, but whether the civil power had not the right to impose laws on the spiritual, and thus uproot, by violating them, the very foundations of the divine organization of the Church.

The champions of the Church fought manfully to avert this sacrilegious violation, urging on the Assembly that to confound the civil with the spiritual jurisdiction would be fatal to both. But the very force of the argument constituted its weak point. The destruction of the spiritual authority, as vested in the Holy See, was precisely what the Jansenists aimed at, while the Jacobins aimed at the overthrow of all authority.

The Civil Constitution was framed with the direct intention of detaching the higher clergy from their lawful head, and exciting a spirit of insubordination amongst the lower clergy towards the higher, than which nothing could be more fatal to the spiritual and social well-being of the Church, nor, consequently, better fitted to work out the purpose of the Assembly.

The Jansenists, had they been accused of complicity with the Revolution in this purpose, would have denied it; but it is none the less certain that in trying to establish a national church on the ruin of the Church universal, they made themselves the active and voluntary agents of the Jacobins. The Abbé Grégoire warned the house to beware of throwing the kingdom into a schism, but admitted that "it was the intention of the Assembly to reduce the authority of the Pope to its proper proportions." The Assembly needed not to be urged in this direction. After several weeks spent in wrangling over the stipends to be allotted to the clergy,

and other minor details, the Civil Constitution was voted with all its clauses on the 12th of July, 1790. All the bill now lacked to give it force of law was the royal sanction.

Louis XVI. was already in communication with Rome on the subject; but steam and electricity had not yet annihilated space, and the answer was necessarily slow in coming. The King, meantime, could scarcely have had any doubt as to what that answer must be. No Catholic instructed in the catechism could suppose that the Holy See would sanction a law which declared monastic vows illegal, which despoiled the clergy, secular and regular, repudiated the authority of Rome altogether in the spiritual and temporal organization of the Church. Pius VI. had up to this point refrained from interfering with current events in France, but he intimated to the King that this silence was not to be construed into indifference or approval, and that he would raise his voice as soon as he felt the moment had arrived for doing so with effect. The King strove to stave off the signing of the Constitution until the promised utterance should have been delivered; his whole soul recoiled from complicity in a deed which was equally repulsive to his conscience as a Catholic and his dignity as a sovereign. Powerful influences were used to strengthen this repugnance and fortify the wavering will of the monarch; Marie Antoinette and the Princess Elizabeth joined with eminent and holy prelates in dissuading him from the fatal concession; but Louis lacked the high-spirited courage of the Queen and that strength of principle which would have enabled him to stand out against the overbearing dictates of the Assembly and the increasing clamor of public opinion. On the 24th of August he signed the death-warrant of the Church of France.

Mr. Jervis points, with an emphasis which implies a certain discreet blame, to the fact that the official condemnation of the Civil Constitution did not come from Rome until the following March. He forgets, in the first place, that a hundred years ago diplomacy was not served by the magic agents now at its command, that a considerable time elapsed before a message could be conveyed from Paris to Rome, and again before an answer could be returned. The question at issue was one of the most momentous which had been raised in the history of the Church, and, before judgment could be delivered, it was essential that every move of importance should be accurately reported and clearly defined, that results, even, to a certain point, should be developed.

He forgets, moreover, that patience and long-suffering silence have been the immemorial policy of that august and supreme power, which is represented by its enemies as ever ready to overrule the legislation of governments and the liberty of nations, and to intermeddle uninvited in mundane affairs. He forgets, again, that the

Mighty Mother does not narrow her vision of human events to the present hour, or limit her scope and action to one place, or time, or people; but, taking her stand upon the watch-tower of eternity, views them as they will affect the great family of the nations to the end of all time.

Without going back to the great Revolution of '93, we see this majestic attitude of the Church exemplified in the petty revolutions of a later date. We see her always Christ-like in her gentleness towards the erring, in her forbearance towards the renegades and the rebels, hoping for their repentance, waiting for their return, believing in them when they have ceased to believe in each other, or in themselves, reckoning with human weakness, human vanity and passion, as no earthly power reckons with them; shrinking to the verge of weakness from irritating the self-love of her enemies, lest it should stand in the way of their return by making submission more painful and difficult. This has ever been the policy of the Church, a policy whose triumphs, even in this world, sometimes illustrate with divine illumination the truth of the beatitude.

Had Louis XVI. waited before signing the Civil Constitution until Rome had formally condemned the revolutionary principles which it embodied, would this abstention have modified the current of events and checked the nation in its headlong downward course? It is impossible even at this distance to venture on an answer to this question. It seems easy, indeed, to speculate in the light of subsequent results on the chances that were in favor of the monarchy, had the King at this critical moment asserted his rights and courageously exercised the royal veto; there was chivalry in the heart of the nation still, both to the throne and to the altar, and a bold and heroic appeal from Louis might have even now turned the tide and saved him—perhaps.

The new system began its operations appropriately enough by violence. The See of Quimper, in Brittany, became vacant, and the electors were at once convoked to proceed to the nomination of a new bishop. The cathedral chapter naturally refused to accept the nominee (who was no other than a member of the Ecclesiastical Committee which had brought about the system under which he was elected), and continued to administer the diocese, *sede vacante.* In a neighboring district an incumbent was presented to a vacant benefice; the local magistrates closed the church door against him, the population broke it open and installed the new pastor triumphantly. These scenes were repeated all over France. The Assembly saw that it had raised a spirit of resistance too widely diffused to be dealt with locally or in individual cases, and that some strong general measure of coercion must be applied.

This resolution took effect in the form of an oath of allegiance

to the Civil Constitution, which was to be compulsory on every ecclesiastic in the kingdom. This oath, which was to include a pledge of "fidelity to the nation, the king, and the new constitution," was to become obligatory within a week from the date of the decree; it was to be taken publicly by every priest throughout France having cure of souls, and was to be administered in all the parish churches at the end of mass, in the presence of the municipal authorities, who were to attest the fact in due form. Any ecclesiastics refusing, or inciting others to refuse to take the oath, were to be punished by the forfeiture of their stipends, to be deprived of their civil rights and declared incapable of any civic function. The words "*Constitution Civile du Clergé*" were to be kept out of the formula, which was perfidiously worded with a view to entrapping the unwary into the belief that they were performing a mere act of adherence to the political constitution, which involved no disloyalty to the spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and consequently no surrender of principle in that direction. Mirabeau, in a speech of extraordinary power and rancor, supported the oath. The Abbé Maury denounced it as an act of illegal persecution, and warned the Assembly of the danger of making martyrs of the clergy. Camus followed with a brilliant vituperation of the Papacy, and declared that "the Pope had no right to any authority in the Church of France."

The debate closed, of course, by the adoption of the oath, November 27th, 1790. Louis XVI. was once more called upon for his signature. Helpless, weaker and more bewildered than ever, he implored for a delay, but the Assembly was in no mood to grant it. Marie Antoinette threw herself at his feet with the saintly Princess Elizabeth, and entreated him with tears to withhold his sanction from this last treacherous attack on the faith and conscience of his subjects; but Louis had no strength left but the strength of inertia and despair. He signed the decree. What it cost him to do so was expressed in his bitter exclamation on the morrow: "I had rather be king of Metz than king of France on these conditions; but it must soon come to an end."

The Abbé Grégoire, the day after the royal sanction had been obtained, mounted the tribune and said he was ready to take the oath. He was followed by sixty curés. Talleyrand and Gobel, bishop of Lydda, were the first members of the hierarchy to follow this initiative. The bishop of Clermont arose and proceeded to say that he would take the oath on the distinct understanding that it did not include the authority of the Assembly in spiritual matters. He was roared down at once. Cries of "The oath, pure and simple!" cut short every attempt he made to explain, and the house announced that the delay to "ecclesiastical public function-

aries" for taking the oath would expire the next day. That next day's sitting was a memorable one in the Assembly. Grégoire tried to rally the clergy to his side, protesting, amidst the suppressed murmurs of the house, that the oath was not incompatible with the integrity of principle, "as the Assembly did not pretend to judge men's consciences, or even demand an internal assent." The agitation at last grew so boisterous and threatening that it spread from the house to the street without, and Bailly, the mayor of Paris, was sent for to maintain order amidst the excited populace. More than two thirds of the clerical deputies refused to take the oath, "giving a noble lesson," says Mr. Jervis, "of faithfulness to the obligations of conscience at the expense of worldly interests, and winning an irrefragable title to the honors of confessorship." Mirabeau himself paid a tribute to their merit, exclaiming: "We have seized their property, but they have preserved their honor!"

One result was at once achieved by the compulsory ministration of the oath, it divided the clergy into two hostile camps—the *assermentés* and *non-assermentés*. The Revolution had now made the threatened schism a fact. It was announced that on the following Sunday the clergy of the metropolis were to take the oath. Bailly and his police officers repaired to Notre Dame in great pomp, to administer it to the clergy of the cathedral. The six vicars-general refused it in a body; the theological seminaries next followed, including the one thousand eight hundred doctors of the Sorbonne, and likewise refused to swear.

At St. Sulpice the clergy, forty-six in number, all refused the oath. The mob rushed into the church, violently maltreated the venerable curé, whom they dragged down from the pulpit and would have killed but for the timely help of some national guards. In other churches the clergy exhibited the same firmness and loyalty, and the mob the same savage violence. Similar scenes were enacted in the provinces. Everywhere the decree was enforced with ruthless severity. Those who refused the oath were not only deprived of office, but prohibited from officiating as priests at all, and any disobedience in this respect was to be visited with penalties which amounted to deprivation of all means of existence.

But the great difficulty of the new system had yet to be faced and overcome; this was the consecration of the new bishops. Nearly one hundred Sees were suddenly vacant, owing to forced resignations. It had been urged with emphatic iteration that, according to the custom of antiquity, the right of institution belonged exclusively to the metropolitan of the province, but now that the Assembly called upon the metropolitans to exert their fallacious right, they refused to do so. Finding every attempt to persuade them unavailing, the Assembly abandoned its strong

point of primitive custom, and decreed that any *assermenté* bishops throughout France might confer canonical institution on any *assermenté* priest without the consent of the metropolitan.

Cazalès courageously denounced in the house the monstrous absurdity and peril of this decree, which must lead inevitably "to the miseries of schism and religious strife. The people will begin to have doubts," he said, "of the validity of the sacraments. . . . You will see Catholics wending over the face of the country in pursuit of their persecuted ministers. . . . Ought you to hesitate to withdraw a decree which must needs produce so many and such great misfortunes?" But the time was long past for such warnings and appeals. The schism was already accomplished, the clergy were divided, and their flocks were already a prey to cruel and distracting doubts. On the whole, the majority was on the side of loyalty. Out of the fifty-two curés of Paris twenty-nine refused to take the oath, and out of the six hundred and seventy priests ministering in the capital four hundred and thirty did likewise. "This majority," observes Mr. Jervis, "is the more remarkable when we consider that, on the one hand, the clergy were plied with all the arts and cajoleries addressed to their natural feelings and self-interest, while, on the other hand, they were exposed to a system of intimidation, the effects of which became more formidable with each day's experience. It must be recollected in addition that no authoritative condemnation of the oath had as yet been promulgated by the Holy See."

The consecration of the new bishops was proceeding with what haste it could. Gobel, bishop of Lydda, the first with Talleyrand to take the oath, had been, as a reward, named to the Archiepiscopal See of Paris, but he could find no one to give him institution. He applied in vain to several of his brother prelates, who had themselves taken the oath, but recoiled from this open breach of ecclesiastical law and discipline. Gobel was finally driven to apply to the magistrates to help him, and they ordered Talleyrand to perform the function. Talleyrand had no more authority to confer the institution than the magistrates themselves, but he gave his services for the occasion, and "amidst salvos of artillery and an imposing parade of civil and military authorities," Gobel was solemnly enthroned as Archbishop of Paris at Notre Dame.

This notable performance closed Talleyrand's ecclesiastical career. He felt probably that the game, as regarded his priestly vocation, was played out, and that the time had come for discarding that rôle and starting in a new one.

Gobel, in his character of metropolitan, next imposed hands on Grègoire, who had been named Bishop of Cher-et-Loire. Mr. Jervis speaks of this ecclesiastic as "beyond comparison the most

distinguished member of the Constitutional episcopate, in respect of general ability and learning, and more especially as to the depth and consistency of religious principles." He assigns at best but a pitiable eminence to Grégoire in placing him at the head of those false or faint-hearted prelates who deserted to the enemies of the Church, either from the lowest motives of self-interest, like their leader, Talleyrand, or from cowardice, or wavering faith; but admitting that Grégoire was honest in the first instance, that he started, like other deluded enthusiasts, with a belief in the exalted motives and salutary purpose of the national movement, it is impossible to believe in "the depth and consistency of the religious principles" of the man who clung to the Revolution when it furled its flag of liberty and generous reform, plunged into unparalleled criminal license, and proclaimed itself the uncompromising enemy of God and religion.

When all the vacant Sees were filled up, the difficulty of finding *curés* for the vacant parishes still remained to be coped with. No orthodox priests would, of course, obey the call of the Constitutional bishops, but there was no lack of *assermentés* ready to take their places. "The elections were for the most part anomalous and disorderly. It was impossible to exercise anything like due discrimination; those who offered themselves were accepted without question, and the result was that the vacancies were filled by a motley crew of monks who had broken their vows and quitted their convents, of ex-professors, unsuccessful and inefficient schoolmasters, of needy adventurers, little troubled by considerations of principle or conscience, provided they could secure the means of subsistence, and of priests who for various causes had incurred ecclesiastical censure. Prudhomme, the new bishop of Mans, was reduced to such straits in order to complete his list of clergy, that he gladly welcomed a troop of young ecclesiastical students who had been dismissed from other dioceses for misconduct, and after a residence of a fortnight in his seminary admitted them to Holy Orders."

No wonder the populations fought shy of such pastors. In many localities the utmost efforts of the authorities failed to force the people to accept their ministrations, or enter the churches where they said mass. After some few months the Constitutional clergy fell into such discredit that in desperation they turned on the orthodox priests and accused them of exciting the faithful against them, whereas they themselves, the non-jurors, were the men who deserved to be denounced as traitors to their country, aristocrats and rebels. The non-jurors retorted by warning the faithful against pastors who had no valid authority for ministering to them, and whose commission was schismatical.

This antagonism soon vented itself in open violence. In Paris, the chapel of the Sisters of Charity, which was served by non-juring priests, was attacked by the mob, who scourged and beat the nuns and drove them out into the streets, mad with pain and terror. Similar outrages were perpetrated in many other quarters. The framers of the *Constitution Civile* began to perceive that they had raised a fiend who was too strong and too lawless to be trusted as an auxiliary. They saw with dismay that their splendid achievement met with approval only from a turbulent minority, that the bulk of the people stood aloof from it, aggrieved and hostile, and, what was more alarming still, that clearsighted partisans of the Revolution were already condemning it as a rash and fatal transaction. "Your detestable *Constitution du Clergé*," said Mirabeau to Camus, "will destroy the Constitution that we are making for ourselves."

This confusion and the disappointment of the authorities were further heightened by the appearance of the Papal brief, "Caritas," which Rome, true to her policy of magnanimity and patience, had withheld till April, 1791, four months from the date of the enforced oath to the Civil Constitution. The brief definitively condemns the principles of the *Constitution Civile*, the schismatical act of Talleyrand and those who followed his example in consecrating the schismatical bishops, and ends by an earnest exhortation to the orthodox clergy to remain bravely at their posts, and to the faithful to avoid all communion with the false shepherds who had been placed over them by illegal powers. This mandate from the Holy See was followed immediately by numerous recantations of the oath from those who had taken it under momentary weakness of conscience or judgment. The Assembly, frightened by the effect of this second brief, relaxed its tyranny against the Holy See, and took some steps to check, or seem to check, the onset of the Revolution against the Church. But its master move was the repudiation of the two briefs as false. They had not been addressed to the Council according to established custom, and there was no nuncio at Paris to act as medium of communication between the Holy See and the Church; these circumstances gave a coloring of truth to the charge of non-authenticity, and led to a confusion which disturbed the minds of honest people who had no direct means of assuring themselves of the orthodoxy of the documents.

Camus was too wise and well-informed to doubt for a moment the authenticity of the briefs, but he feigned to do so, and attacked the Papal utterances, declaring that, even if authentic, the Pope had no right to interfere in France or to condemn the acts of the Constitution.

Persecution grew bolder and fiercer every day. Enraged at the

preference of the people for the non-juring priests, the Assembly determined to take more wholesale measures for getting rid of them. A law was accordingly passed whereby, at the petition of any twenty residents, any such priest might be banished by the local magistrate within twenty-four hours, the least delay or opposition on the part of the priest to be visited with prompt and stringent penalties. The Jacobins knew that Louis would in all probability refuse to sanction this draconian decree, which was passed simultaneously with one disbanding the Royal Guard and ordering the formation of a camp of twenty thousand *fédérés* under the walls of Paris, "in hopes," says De Moleville, "that the King would reject them," and thus precipitate his own downfall.

Louis was, indeed, in a state of mind bordering on distraction. He had never been the same from the fatal moment when he signed the Civil Constitution, and now that resistance to further exactions was too late to avail, he found courage to resist. When the document was presented for his sanction, he affixed the royal veto to it, and dissolved the Cabinet. General Dumouriez, who remained in office some few days after his colleagues, used his influence to make Louis sign the decree, urging that, after having accepted the Civil Constitution, it was worse than folly to draw back now.

"Yes, I committed a great fault," replied Louis, mournfully, "and I reproach myself for it." And so Dumouriez pleaded in vain.

This veto of the King was almost the last act of royal prerogative exercised by Louis XVI. It was performed on the 19th of June, and was answered on the morrow by the *émeute* of the Faubourg St. Antoine. The mob invaded the Tuileries, burst open the doors of the King's apartment, and ordered him to recall the ministry and sign the decrees. In this extremity the kinghood rose up in Louis; he faced the rioters without quailing, and declared that violence should never extract from him a concession injurious to the welfare of his subjects. In less than two months later, he was deposed and a prisoner, and the Assembly ruled that the decrees which he had refused to sanction should have force of law.

Mr. Jervis here, as through the course of the whole history, introduces passages of the stormy debates of the house with a skill of selection which adds singularly to the brilliancy and force of his narrative; he makes us read on with the breathless interest that we feel in some actual occurrence of our own day, combined with the fascination of a powerful historical romance.

That must truly have been a sensational *séance* when Tallien arose, terrified the Assembly with the announcement that in a few days the soil "would be purged of the presence of every refractory priest," and Danton roared out in his stentorian tones: "Yes, the tocsin is about to sound the signal for a general onslaught on

the enemies of France." A scheme of wholesale massacre was, in fact, quickly set on foot. On the night of the 29th, two days after this sitting, domiciliary visits were made in Paris, three thousand persons, chiefly priests and religious, were arrested, and every prison filled to bursting. The butchery began on the 2d of September. The first victims were twenty-three priests, who were conveyed from the Mairie to the Abbaye and butchered there. At the Carmelite Convent of the Rue Vaugirard, one hundred and fifteen were slaughtered.

Next day, nearly one hundred priests were massacred at the Seminary of St. Firmin; others at La Force, and "six hundred were burned alive on the Place Dauphiné."[1] Throughout the provinces blood flowed in torrents during these dreadful days. The Revolution, like a drunken savage, seemed possessed of a demon of murder.

The Assembly, having now deposed the King, found itself in a difficulty concerning the civic oath. It was a palpable absurdity to make men swear "fidelity to the King," when royalty was abolished, so the formula was altered to a pledge to maintain, to the utmost of their power, liberty and equality. The question had now to be answered, whether this new oath was compatible with the conscience of a Catholic and a priest. It seemed, on the face of it, *no* more than an adhesion to the *political* principles on which the Revolution had first started. Many of the most respected of the orthodox clergy viewed it in this light, and were of opinion that it might be adopted. The venerable Abbé Emery took this view; but, with his usual docility to the Holy See, he declined to pronounce one way or the other until Rome had spoken, or at any rate until some directions could be obtained from the bishops. It was not, however, easy to obtain advice from either of these sources; distance, and the difficulties and obstacles and perils in the way of communication, interfered between the consulting party and the counsellors, and a decision had to be come to which admitted of no delay. Numbers of his holiest and most esteemed brethren entreated the Abbé Emery to take upon himself the responsibility of deciding for them, and to authorize them by his personal example to take the oath. If they refused it, there was nothing for them but the alternative of starvation or the plague-stricken shores of Cayenne, while their exile would be to thousands of Catholics the deprivation of all sacramental succor and spiritual consolation.

The Abbé, in sore perplexity, applied to those in the Assembly who had drawn up the new formula, and being positively assured by them that the terms "liberty and equality" were to be understood simply as the repudiation of a despotic covenant and invidious

[1] We leave to Mr. Jervis the responsibility of this statement, which we have not been able to verify from any of the sources at hand.

privileges, he consented to take the oath without further hesitation. His example was followed by numbers of the vicars-general, the congregation of St. Sulpice, and the clergy of Paris. Unfortunately, this led to a controversy between those of the clergy who took the oath and those who refused to take it. These latter censured the Abbé Emery, who replied that he had done what his conscience dictated under the circumstances, and that he was ready to retract the moment the Holy See notified its disapproval. Meanwhile, the oath was taken by the majority of the *non-assermentés* throughout France. The Abbé Emery's conduct was no doubt justified by the advantages which the orthodox clergy thus acquired in the exercise of their ministry; but the compromise which resulted in these advantages also produced many evils. The clergy and the faithful grew perplexed on the subject of the oaths; many confounded the new formula with the old one, and the ministrations of orthodox priests were rejected because they were supposed to have taken the oath of allegiance to the Civil Constitution. Some of the clergy had taken both oaths, some had rejected both; some had taken the first and refused the second; others had rejected the first, while they complied with the second. This anomalous state of things had at any rate one good result: it showed up the proceedings of the Assembly and its ecclesiastical legislation as the farce they were, and made the Revolution appear grotesque as well as brutal in its excesses.

It soon became evident that those who had taken the second oath had made a useless concession, and that nothing short of apostatizing, and throwing in their lot with the Revolution, would appease its savage hate. Priests who had taken the oath were arrested, exiled, or guillotined. The Abbé Emery himself was in prison before many months, and was detained there for a year and a half, his name being day after day smuggled off the list of doomed prisoners who were called for to be tried for their life.

Fresh edicts were fulminated against the priests, surpassing in ferocity all previous ones. A general edict was issued ordering them to quit France within forty-eight hours. Those apprehended in the country after this delay, were to be executed within four and twenty hours. Priests were conveyed in batches on convict-ships to the deadly swamps of West Africa, suffering on the voyage every species of cruelty and indignity.

In contrast to this barbarous treatment at the hands of France and her government, the persecuted clergy met with boundless hospitality and sympathy in other countries. Some two thousand of them reached the Pontifical States, and received there from Pius VI. the welcome of a father and a prince. Catholic Spain opened her arms to the exiles, and her bishops and clergy gave to

the world a noble example of evangelical hospitality. The Austrian Netherlands were not behindhand in this generous competition, and such was the kindly zeal of the Swiss mountaineers that there were numerous instances of young men and women going out to service in order to make room in their straitened homes for the perishing wanderers from France. After citing abundant proofs of the kindness of other nations, it is permissible to quote the Abbé Barruel's testimony to the charity exercised by Protestant England toward the Gallican clergy. "It was necessary," says the Abbé, in his *Histoire du Clergé*, "to have lived three years in the midst of French Constitutionalists, Maratists, and Jacobins of every description, in order to appreciate the refreshment and enjoyment which the first aspect of these Englishmen imparted to our priests on their arrival." He enters into details of the hospitality tendered to himself and his fellow-exiles, and describes how crowds of strange but welcoming faces met them at the harbor, and disputed the privilege of entertaining them, "seeming," he declares, "more anxious about our means of subsistence than we were ourselves." Conveyances were placed at the exiles' disposal, and those who were anxious to reach London were taken there free of expense; country houses were opened to others, money was placed in their hands, and nothing was left undone to soften the miseries of their position. The number of the *emigrés* increased with such rapidity that it was soon found necessary to organize measures on a large scale for dealing with their wants. The royal residence at Westminster, called "King's House," was placed at the permanent disposal of as many French priests as it would hold, and a committee was formed for collecting funds under government patronage for their support. There were soon six thousand French priests in England and Jersey, but in proportion to the strain put upon the public generosity, the relief increased. The committee, in ministering to the needs of the exiles, bore witness to the courage, fortitude, and gentleness which they exhibited amidst their trials. "Not content with vying with each other in the most rigid parsimony," said the commissioners, "they have evinced an unintermitting anxiety to lessen, by every effort in their power, the weight of their charge upon the community." Mr. Bowdler, the Protestant president of the committee of relief, declared that the suffering clergy spoke of their banishment and privations "with the feelings of men, but with the piety and resignation of Christians."

In striking contradiction to this exemplary conduct of the persecuted priesthood of France abroad, was that of their Constitutional brethren at home. The majority of these latter had taken wives, or were leading scandalously immoral lives; many had thrown off the restraints of religious belief altogether, and openly professed

infidelity; a certain number apostatized, and appealed to the Assembly for pensions, on the score that they had renounced the profession of lies and abominations by which they had been gaining a livelihood, and with which the Church had for centuries been demoralizing humanity. "We advance from miracle to miracle," wrote the commissioners Lequino and Laignelot, from La Rochelle, "eight functionaries of the Catholic worship, with a Protestant minister, *unpriested themselves* on Thursday last, in the presence of the whole population, in the temple of truth, heretofore the parish church. . . . They tested their oaths by burning their letters of priesthood in a vase full of incense. All the people, Catholics and Protestants, swore, with acclamations, to forget their ancient superstitions. . . . A large picture of the Rights of Man is about to replace the tabernacles of ridiculous and childish mysteries, and other pictures on the walls will commemorate the Constitutional act."

The abjuration of Talleyrand's anointed, the Constitutional bishop, Gobel, soon followed these disgraceful scenes. The unhappy old man was, in truth, but the tool of the Jacobins, and the victim of his own cowardly weakness.

Hébert and several of his confederates repaired in the night-time to Gobel's house, waked him up, and informed him that he must on the morrow go to the Convention and publicly abjure and deny Jesus Christ, and proclaim his religion a tissue of lies and absurdities. The terrified old man fell on his knees, and implored them not to exact this act of sacrilege from him; he clung to them, he rolled on the floor in agonies of despair, but the answer to his cries was, "Thou must do it or die." He was not prepared for the alternative, so the next day he gave to the world the grotesque and monstrous spectacle of his public apostasy, and walked out of the Convention with a red cap on his head in place of the mitre which he had cast down and dishonored.

Twenty other Constitutional bishops followed Gobel's example, and publicly abjured Christianity in language of the foulest blasphemy. These personal apostasies were the prelude to the diabolical farce enacted at Notre Dame, when a naked woman was enthroned on the altar of the true God.

In the other churches of Paris similar abominations were perpetrated, notably in the venerable old church of St. Sulpice, where a blaspheming fanatic rushed into the pulpit and defied the Almighty to strike him dead for denying His existence. "He strikes not!" cried the maniac; "therefore it is manifest that He does not exist!" The popular madness had now reached the flood-mark, which was the signal for it to pause and to recede. Robespierre saw this, and his political instinct, quickened by personal hatred of Hébert, the prophet of the Goddess Reason, prompted

him to stand forward and denounce this persecution that was being carried on in the name of Atheism. At a sitting of the Jacobin Club, November 20th, 1793, he made a speech in which he declared that Atheism was aristocratic, whereas "the idea of a great Being who watches over oppressed innocence and punishes triumphant wickedness is altogether popular. If God did not exist it would be necessary to invent Him."

The fête of the Supreme Being followed in June as the practical development of this blasphemous *credo*. Before the year was out Robespierre's head fell under the knife of the guillotine, and the Revolution received its death-blow.

Robespierre's death, which opened the prison doors all over France, came in time to save the Abbé Emery, who had been for seventeen months in daily expectation of being led to the scaffold. During all that time the old paladin priest had been doing the work of an apostle amongst his fellow-prisoners in the Conciergerie, instructing, converting, consoling, and encouraging them. Writing to the Holy Father after his liberation, the Abbé Emery assures him that numbers of the Constitutional priests who were in prison with him, and left it for the scaffold, died penitent, retracted their oath before the tribunal, and were through his ministry reconciled to the Church. Of the eight schismatical bishops, including Gobel, who died by the guillotine, the majority made their confession and recantation into the Abbé Emery's hands. The Revolution had been mortally stricken when Robespierre fell, but it was not yet killed; it lingered on like a wounded wild beast, convulsed and still infuriated in its agonies. Tallien, Barras, Fouché, Thibaudeau, and Barère were not inclined to repeal the draconian edicts of the Terror. The Jacobin clubs and committees, that had held the country gagged, bound, and bridled, a contemptible minority tyrannizing and terrorizing an overwhelming majority, were still in force, and the Directoire which replaced the Convention carried on its work of anti-Christian persecution with undiminished malignity, though with a change of formulas. The Goddess Reason and the Supreme Being were deposed, and the churches were opened in certain places. The first day that the Holy Sacrifice was offered up openly in the great cities is fitly described as "a day of general resurrection." But the Republic, which proclaimed that it "recognized no form of religion and took no account of priests," was not to let this joyous dawn grow into the full light of noon. Just as the Church and the faithful were beginning to breathe, the *coup d'état* of 18th Fructidor (September, 1795) came to dash down the cup of peace and unsheathe the sword once more. The use of church bells was forbidden, and vast numbers of priests were again seized and thrown into prison; the Decade

was substituted for Sunday, the Gregorian calendar was abolished, a new oath was exacted from the orthodox clergy, incompatible with their conscience, and other intolerable conditions were imposed on them.

Things seemed on the point of plunging into more inextricable confusion than ever when the remnant of the Constitutional bishops who had escaped the guillotine, had recourse to the idea of a national council which was to discuss and adjust all differences between the orthodox and schismatical clergy, and between both these again and the state. This curious assembly, of which the Abbé Grégoire was to be the moving spirit, was inaugurated with great pomp at Notre Dame on the feast of the Assumption. A mock attempt was made to obtain the co-operation or approval of the Holy See, but naturally Pius VI. ignored the whole proceedings. The Directoire avenged the national council for this affront by at once ordering the French troops to seize the Pontiff, then in his eighty-third year, paralyzed and stricken with many painful infirmities, and to remove him from Rome to Valence. Throughout the journey of sixty days the "citizen Pope," as the Republican escort styled him, was treated like a convict of the lowest class, lodged in rooms which were purposely ornamented with engravings of loathsome immorality, and reduced to such straits of poverty that he was obliged to sell the silver buckles off his shoes. He reached Valence in the last stage of exhaustion and suffering, lingered there for a year in captivity, and died with a blessing on his lips.

It seemed now truly that the gates of hell had prevailed, that the Papacy was destroyed forever, and the triumph of the Revolution secure. But once again that triumph was to be frustrated. A Nemesis was at hand in the person of the brilliant young captain, whose victorious fame had clothed him with the prestige of a demigod in the dazzled eyes of his countrymen.

Bonaparte, with the electric instinct of genius, felt that the Revolution had run its course, that France, in stamping the Church out of her midst, had, to use Talleyrand's expression, "taken out our bones," and that the first step towards reconstructing this maimed and mutilated body was to put the bones back again. The *coup d'état* of the Orangerie put the young hero at the head of the nation, and he set promptly to work to quell the strife of parties and passions that was still raging fiercely all over the country. Flushed by victory, with a sense of universal power, he proceeded to sweep away the vexatious laws and barriers that had been created by the Jacobins. The absurd Decade was abolished, as well as the oath of hatred to royalty. The churches were opened definitively and the priesthood relieved from the harassing legisla-

tion which had so long pursued them. Bonaparte, who had the unerring intuition of a born ruler of men, knew that men were only to be ruled by that curb of inward assent to a divine law, without which outward barriers are of little avail. "Men who have no God are not governable," he said long after at St. Helena. "I saw those men at work in '93; you don't govern them; you shoot them down." He meant to govern Frenchmen, so he determined to call in the Church as the most efficient of police to assist him in the task. For this purpose he opened negotiations with the Holy See in order to find a *modus vivendi* which should reconcile the new order of things, mended by him, with the immutable exactions of the Church. Pius VII. was far more desirous to bring about this reconciliation than Bonaparte himself, and Cardinal Consalvi was promptly dispatched to Paris to treat with the man who held the destinies of France in his hand. Bonaparte received the Papal legate with the utmost cordiality, but when it came to adjusting the rights and principles of the Church with the requirements of his own despotic policy, the First Consul unmasked his batteries and showed the real motive of his conciliating overtures. His conduct throughout the whole transaction offers an example of violence, bad faith, insolence, and audacity unparalleled in history. Lying was a weapon that Bonaparte had always used as freely as grape-shot, so much so that "to lie like a bulletin" became a popular saying in the *grande armée*, and this weapon he employed unscrupulously in dealing with the Holy See.

The history of the Concordat is ably and interestingly summarized by Mr. Jervis, and with remarkable appreciation of facts and characters. He shows us, on the one side, Consalvi, shrewd, lofty-minded, patient, courteous, eager for conciliation and ready to embrace it at every cost save that of principle, and imbued with a faith in the good faith of his adversary which from a noble nature must have called out a worthy response; and, on the other hand, Bonaparte, treacherous, imperious, and violent, demeaning himself by turns like a maniac, a mountebank, and a hypocrite, indulging in outbursts of frenzied rage, in tricks and threats and cajolery, ignoring every principle but expediency, crushing every argument by his overpowering personality, and having recourse to deliberate fraud in the end when every other means had failed him. A copy of the treaty, which had received the approval of Bonaparte himself and of the Papal legate, was about to be officially signed by both, when luckily Consalvi discovered that the document had been falsified, and laid down the pen with an exclamation of dismay. Bernier, Talleyrand, and Portalis sheltered themselves behind the First Consul, whose characteristic defence of the fraud was that so long

as a document was not signed "one always had a right to make changes."

The grand obstacle that stood in the way of a final arrangement was the question of the new hierarchy which was to replace the ancient one suppressed by the Revolution. Ten metropolitan and fifty suffragan sees were to be created, and the Cardinal Legate was to be empowered to give canonical institution to the new prelates. But here an insuperable difficulty presented itself, *i. e.*, that of bringing about a compromise between the orthodox clergy and the *assermentés*, between the confessors who had bravely stood to their colors, and risked all and lost all save life in their loyalty to the Church, and those faithless servants who had deserted her in the storm. These latter, it is true, professed themselves penitent and were humbly petitioning to be received back to their allegiance. Both Consalvi and the Abbé Bernier were prepared to go to the utmost limits in admitting the sincerity of their repentance and the honesty of the alleged motives which had led them astray; but it was indispensable before they could be appointed pastors over the faithful that they should make not merely a sincere but a public and complete recantation of their errors.

Bonaparte and the Jacobins fought with all their might and all their authority to save the Constitutionals from this bitter humiliation; but Consalvi was implacable. "They must confess and retract their errors," he maintained, "and declare that they accept the decrees of the Holy See relating to the affairs of France, that is, the briefs condemning the civil constitution and the unlawful ordinations which took place under its sanction."

With this ultimatum the Cardinal Legate quitted Paris and returned to Rome to submit the long-contested treaty to the Holy See. Pius VII. had been prepared from the starting to make every concession within the limits of theological possibility in order to restore France to Christianity and heal the breach made between the nation and the Church by the Revolution, but when it came to actually signing the Concordat his courage almost failed. He held the pen in his hand for a moment, and exclaimed with unconcealed emotion: "I will sign it, but in doing so I am going to the very gates of hell!"

The mighty and momentous transaction received the Papal sanction on the 15th of August, 1801, and Cardinal Caprara was dispatched with the document to the First Consul in the capacity of Papal Legate.

No signature, however, could insure Bonaparte's good faith, or bind him to the loyal fulfilment of his plighted word. He at once opened out again the burning question of the recantation of the Constitutionals, and the battle that had been so long and painfully

contested, had to be fought all over again. The result was that five months elapsed between the signing of the Concordat by the Pope and its presentation to the Chambers. When finally it was submitted to them, it was not in its integral form as it had come from Rome, but with a superadded text called *Articles Organiques*, an appendage which, as Consalvi remarks in his *Mémoires*, "almost entirely overturned the new edifice which we had taken so much pains to build up. Whatever the Concordat had exacted in favor of the liberty of the Church and its worship was once more brought into question by means of the Gallican jurisprudence, and the Church of France had good reason to fear that she might soon find herself reduced to slavery."

The indignation of Pius VII. on learning the swindle that had been practiced upon him was equal to his dismay. He at once protested solemnly in the Consistory against this fresh manœuvre of the First Consul, to whom his protestation was speedily transmitted. But Bonaparte ignored it. He coolly issued a proclamation summoning France to rejoice at the restoration of the Catholic Church, and a solemn festival was forthwith held at Notre Dame to celebrate the reconciliation of the nation with the Holy See.

Pius VII. was deeply wounded by this conduct and wrote an autograph letter to the First Consul, in which he appealed to his honor and good faith to cancel the enactments which the Holy See was credited in France with having sanctioned, while it condemned and deplored them. To this, Bonaparte returned an evasive answer, but assured the Pope that the Organic Articles could in no way interfere with the execution of the Concordat. This assurance was both treacherous and untrue. The Organic Articles were a petty, vexatious and ridiculous piece of legislation, framed, not, we will grant, for the express purpose of impeding the execution of the Concordat, but as a means of escaping from it, and counteracting it in case of need. For instance, Art. 1 rules, "No bull, brief, decree, mandate, provision, signature serving as a provision, nor other expeditions from the court of Rome, *even concerning individuals*, can be received, published, printed or otherwise put into execution, without the authorization of the Government."

Art. 3. "The decrees of foreign synods, even those of the General Councils, cannot be published in France until the Government shall have examined them," etc.

Art. 4. "No national or metropolitan council, or diocesan synod, no deliberating assembly can take place without the express permission of the Government."

Art. 11. "Archbishops and bishops may, *with the authorization*

of the Government, found Cathedral chapters and seminaries in their dioceses, but all other ecclesiastical establishments are prohibited."

Art. 12. "Archbishops and bishops may take the title of citizen or monsieur, but all other qualifications are forbidden."

Art. 17 rules that every nominee for a bishopric "shall be examined in doctrine by a bishop and two priests named by the First Consul, the examiners to send up a report of the examination to the councillor of state charged with matters concerning worship."

Art. 20. "Bishops cannot leave their dioceses without the permission of the First Consul."

Art. 25. "The bishops are to send in every year to his councillor of state the names of those seminarists who are destined to the ecclesiastical state."

Art. 26. "The bishops can ordain no one until the person to be ordained shall have been approved by the Government."

Art. 39. "There is to be but one liturgy and one catechism for all the Catholic churches of France."

These few extracts from the *Articles Organiques* will suffice to show the drift and animus of the instrument which was presented and printed as "*une Convention passée le* 26 *Messidor, an IX., entre le pape et le gouvernement français*," and which Protestant writers are apt to speak of as having been recognized and accepted by the Holy See. The Pope, as we have seen, indignantly denounced the imposition from the first, and never ceased to denounce it. His successors have repudiated the Organic Articles with the same absolute and unqualified denial; they have been willing to let them fall into oblivion, as a law that has become obsolete without having been repealed, but from time to time the voice of the Holy See has continued to be raised in protest against them as an illegitimate and intolerable piece of legislation, calculated to interfere at every step with the dignity and freedom of action secured to the Church of France by the Concordat.

Having thus *posed* himself as the patron of the Holy See and the restorer of religion, Bonaparte claimed his reward. He invited Pius VII. to come and crown him Emperor of France. The invitation, though couched in a style of filial deference, was in reality the command of a despot who meant to enforce it. Pius VII. was willing to acknowledge the benefits which his high-handed patronage had secured to the Church, but what chiefly inclined him to condescend to the imperial demand, was the hope of obtaining the suppression of the *Articles Organiques*, a bait that was held out to him from France, and which those around him were of opinion he should make every possible sacrifice to secure. The Pope, moreover, was anxious to apply a salve to the wound, as yet but partially closed, between the two classes of the clergy, and to con-

sole the faithful, sorely tried by the schism, which still lingered on and disturbed the peace of many. These various motives combined to decide him to accede to Bonaparte's request.

The story of the Papal visit, from the moment the Sovereign Pontiff set foot on French soil to the day he left, reads like a chapter from some mediæval romance, in which fact and fiction, the sublime and the ridiculous, the pathetic and the grotesque, are curiously interwoven.

An initial ceremony, which Pius VII. insisted upon as an indispensable prelude to the gorgeous apotheosis of the coronation, was the religious marriage of Bonaparte with Josephine. With great reluctance the Emperor-elect consented to the ceremony, but exacted that it should be performed with the utmost secrecy, at midnight. The darkness, the mystery which presided over the whole scene, the nervous anxiety of the wife, already trembling for her position at the moment when it was, to all appearances, being magnificently assured, her entreaties for the certificate, which Cardinal Fesch was so strangely reluctant to deliver, the passionate throbbing of two human hearts diversely agitated with ambition and with love, with trust and treachery, all this is as the drama within the comedy, "the life within the life," and lends a touch of nature to the semi-barbaric pageant in which the two were to play their splendid rôle on the morrow.

The sun rose merrily on the 2d of December, 1804, and it was under a cloudless sky that the hero of a hundred fights wended his way to the old cathedral and took his seat on the golden throne prepared for him. The rite proceeded amidst artillery and music. The Pope, who had come from the Eternal City on purpose to place the crown upon his head, raised the symbol of sovereignty from the altar, but Bonaparte took it quietly from his uplifted hands, and laid it on his own head.

Pius VII. having so far condescended to the wishes of the Emperor, looked anxiously for the compensations he had been led to expect, but they were not forthcoming. When he demanded the fulfilment of the promise that the Catholic religion should be declared dominant in France, he was answered that such a measure would be imprudent, and was, moreover, unnecessary, seeing that the fact of the imperial family being Catholic constituted the national religion Catholic. As to the suppression of the Articles, it was not even to be discussed.

Pius VII. returned to Rome, after a sojourn of five months in France, without having gained the smallest political advantage in any direction. The only substantial concessions he obtained from the newly-crowned successor of Charlemagne, were the re-establishment of the Christian Brothers, the Marists, and the Sisters of

St. Vincent of Paul, and an increase in the stipend of the lower clergy.

As soon as the Sovereign Pontiff had left his dominions, Napoleon gave him to understand that his position henceforth was to be that of chief almoner to the empire, and his duty to assist the Emperor to govern the conscience of the French nation through the instrumentality of the Holy See. He began by styling himself "Emperor of Rome," in addressing the Pope, and proceeded to make the most extravagant claims of sovereignty; amongst other things, he exacted that all subjects of those nations with whom France was at war, should be expelled from Rome, and their vessels ordered out of all the Roman ports. To this preposterous demand Pius VII. gave an emphatic refusal. He replied that he recognized no distinction of nationalities; those who were at war with Napoleon were just as much his children as those who were at peace with him. Threats and promises having failed to move him from this principle, Napoleon had recourse to his usual natural argument of brute force. On February 2d the French troops entered Rome, planted their flag on the Castle of St. Angelo and a battery in front of the Quirinal, took the Pope prisoner, and carried him away to Savona.

When, however, he had got thus far, Napoleon, to his surprise, found that there was a fortress within the fortress which refused to surrender to his arms, that he had come into collision with a will as resolute as his own. The Concordat was the listed field where these opposing wills once more met and pitted their strength one against the other. In the Concordat it was provided that the bishops who were named by the Emperor should receive institution from the Pope, a prerogative which had been violated by the civil constitution, and whose violation had been the chief cause of calling down the anathema of the Holy See on that scheme. A number of sees were now vacant, and the nominees of the Emperor awaited the sanction of the Pope, who refused to grant it. This resistance lasted ten months. At the end of that time there were twenty-seven sees vacant, among them the Archiepiscopal See of Paris.

The Emperor brought the whole weight of his influence and authority to bear on Pius VII. in order to compel his approval of the prelates-elect, but in vain. The Pope replied that he was a close prisoner, deprived of all assistance from his legitimate councillors, cut off from communication with those sources of information that should guide his judgment; he was bereft even of the services of his secretary; under these conditions he could not, in conscience, accede to the imperial appeal. Napoleon, upon this, determined to fill up the vacant sees without more ado. He

sent for Cardinal Fesch to Fontainebleau, and ordered him to become Archbishop of Paris.

"Sire," replied the Cardinal, "I must wait for canonical institution from the Holy Father."

Napoleon, exasperated by this combined opposition to his will, flew into one of his imperial rages, and commanded the Cardinal to obey him.

"Sire, *potius mori!*" was the sturdy reply; whereupon the Emperor, purposely misunderstanding him, retorted:

"*Potius Mori?* You would rather have Maury? Very well; you shall have Maury!"

Maury, who had been the champion of the Church, and confessed to the faith when both these acts of courage put his life in imminent peril, Maury bowed to the iron will of Cæsar, took the metropolitan see, and held it in defiance of the Papal brief refusing him institution.

But the Emperor was becoming too impatient to go on thus coping with the recalcitrant prelates one by one; he resolved to compel submission from all by a measure highly characteristic of the man. He called a council, intimating to the bishops, "*mes evêques*," as he styled them,—regarding the princes of the Church pretty much in the light of so many prefects and generals, high functionaries under his command—his order to pass a decree empowering the metropolitan to give institution without reference to Rome. The bishops, cowed by his overmastering violence, and dreading the consequences of an open breach, justified but too fully his estimate of their docility. The venerable old Abbé Emery alone stood out with a noble boldness, which won from Napoleon the tribute of his respect and admiration.

"That Abbé Emery is the only man I am afraid of!" exclaimed the conqueror of Europe, proving once more how supreme is the dominion of a noble character over all other powers and agencies.

The Emperor's struggle with the Holy See involved him in deeper difficulties as he went on. While the council of bishops was endeavoring to effect a compromise which might adjust, even temporarily, the difficulty concerning canonical institution, Napoleon was intent on another question of momentous interest to himself; this was the dissolution of his marriage with Josephine. The Court of Vienna having refused to entertain his suit for the hand of an Austrian archduchess until a brief from Rome should declare this marriage null and void, it became essential to obtain the brief at all costs. Napoleon convened "his bishops" again, and ordered the whole of the sacred college to come to Paris and hold a council for the purpose of granting him a divorce. Twenty-

nine cardinals answered to the call. Thirteen out of that number, including Consalvi, were of opinion that there were no grounds for declaring the former marriage void, and protested that they could not sanction nor appear at the approaching nuptials of Marie Louise and the Emperor.

Fouché exerted his utmost influence in vain to change this resolution. Consalvi, whose approval the Emperor held to be above all, declared that no power on earth should induce him either to retract his condemnation of the divorce, or to lend the countenance of his presence to the coming marriage. He and his colleagues made good this assertion; but the divorce was wrenched from the divided and hesitating council, and on the 2d of April, 1810, Napoleon led his young bride to Notre Dame amidst the thunder of artillery and the clanging of marriage-bells. The next day, the thirteen absentees presented themselves at the Tuileries to take part in some official reception, but while they were waiting, amidst all the dignitaries of the Empire, for the entrance of their imperial host, a chamberlain entered and informed them that they must withdraw, as the Emperor declined to receive them. On the morrow they received notification of the entire confiscation of their property, private and ecclesiastical, and their degradation from all external rank and dignity, including the suppression of their title of cardinal, and a sentence of exile to various remote districts, where they were to be under *surveillance* of the police. Consalvi was banished to Rheims, and kept there a prisoner until the fall of the tyrant, four years later, set all his victims free.

But the cup of Napoleon's iniquities towards the Church was not yet full. Unable to conquer "the old man of the Vatican," and seeing that the prolonged struggle with the Holy See was entangling himself and his bishops in deeper and more inextricable perplexities, he determined on once more summoning an ecclesiastical commission. The measure was a mere mockery, seeing neither privacy nor independence were insured to the commissioners. Napoleon broke in upon their sittings unannounced, attacked the questions under discussion, stormed and ranted when his judgments were disputed, and demeaned himself with his habitual violence and insolence towards the assembled prelates. Finally, on the 17th of March, he burst out into a tirade which surpassed all previous exhibitions of the kind, declared that, if the Pope persisted in his obstinacy, he, Napoleon, would tear up the Concordat, that in fact he considered it as no longer existing. The assembled prelates "maintained a scandalous silence," says Consalvi, who was informed by many present at the scene; "it was reserved for a humble priest to save the honor of his order. This priest was the Abbé Emery." When Napoleon, ignoring the whole assemblage

of cardinals and bishops, addressed the Abbé directly as the one man whose judgment he thought worth suing for, the old priest stood up, and answered him with the simplicity and boldness of a confessor, challenging his opinions, disproving his conclusions, and finally extracting from him a tacit admission of their fallacy in the exclamation that he muttered to himself, "Oh! yes: the catechism! the catechism!" . . . .

But this tribute of respect to the Abbé Emery, whose voice was heard on this occasion for the last time amongst his brethern, was not followed by any practical recognition of the principles which the venerable ecclesiastic had so valiantly defended. The Commission was dissolved, a national council was convoked, and a deputation was sent to Savona to cajole or bully the captive Pope into granting a brief empowering the metropolitan of the vacant sees to grant institution. The deputies, consisting of eight bishops and five cardinals, brought all their influence to bear on the Pontiff to induce his consent to the Emperor's demands; no argument was left unemployed to calm his scruples and persuade him that the best interests of the Church of France, the peace of the clergy and the salvation of souls throughout the Empire, united to counsel the concession. A fortnight passed in these conferences, and then the Pope yielded. He was broken in health, and his mental powers severely shaken by his long captivity and great bodily sufferings.

"In proportion," writes Mr. Jervis, "as by their skilful intervention they (the deputies) succeeded in removing the doubts and prejudices which had tormented his sensitive conscience, he showed himself infinitely relieved and comforted. His countenance resumed its natural expression of serenity; and when the affair was brought finally to a conclusion, 'he testified,' writes the prefect de Charleroi, 'a joy like that of a child who has just been delivered from some great infantine trouble.'"

But this large concession of the persecuted Pope failed to satisfy the insatiable despotism of Napoleon. The deputies, instead of being praised for the success of their mission, were received with reproaches and blame. The Emperor considered the brief far too independent in its tone and too restricted in its conditions; it was couched in terms offensive to the imperial supremacy, the Church of Rome was mentioned as "the Mother and Mistress of all churches;" in fact, the long-desired reconciliation which it had cost so much to bring about was as far off as if the Holy Father had sent away the deputies briefless.

But events, which were to have a momentous effect on the destinies of Napoleon himself, were hurrying on the issue of his quarrel with the Holy See. He set out on his fatal expedition to Moscow, and all other interests and events were for the time laid aside, when

suddenly, his attention was again directed to the captive of Savona. A plan seems to have been arranged between England and Austria for carrying away Pius VII. and placing him in a safe asylum, either in Sicily or Malta; the Pope himself being a consenting party to the scheme. Before, however, it could be carried out, the secret was discovered by the French police, Napoleon was informed of it, and an order was issued for the immediate removal of the prisoner to Fontainebleau. The utmost secrecy was to be observed concerning the journey, and the details as to the manner in which it was to be performed were written by the great captain himself from Dresden, where he happened to be when the news of the Anglo-Austrian plan reached him.

Pius VII. was hurried away from Savona in the dead of the night, on the 10th of June, 1812, and transported across the mountains with such haste and discomfort that he fell dangerously ill, and was compelled to halt for three days at Mont Cenis. He reached Fontainebleau on the 19th, utterly prostrated by fatigue and illness. Here his external sufferings, at least, came to an end. The *Moniteur* announced that the "Pope was now free," and the hearts of the faithful were thrilled with a momentary joy in the delusive belief that the end of his humiliation and the sufferings of the Church had come. The splendid suite of apartments that he had occupied when he came to crown the Emperor were again placed at his disposal, the high dignitaries of the empire hastened to pay their court to him, and prelates flocked to kiss his feet. The autumn passed in comparative peace. On the morning of the 17th of December came the startling "29th bulletin of the Grand Army," announcing to France that the invincible soldier and his conquering legions had been overtaken by an appalling disaster. The Emperor hurried back to Paris. Even in this extremity of distress and failure and dismay, his thoughts turned to the captive at Fontainebleau as to an object of supreme and immediate importance. He arrived unannounced at the palace, and held a conference of several hours with the Pope. The account of that interview has been variously told. The belief prevailed long and generally that Napoleon had given way to personal violence, that in his ungovernable passion he had struck the infirm and aged Pontiff; but the assurance of Pius VII. himself clears Napoleon of this culminating disgrace. What remains to his charge is bad enough. That his demeanor was brutal in its fury of unrestrained violence is certain. He used the language, the tone, the insolent threatening gestures of an infuriated jailer bent on forcing a feeble and helpless captive to succumb to his will. When the Pope, unmoved by his fulsome professions of filial attachment and promises of eternal devotion, muttered with a smile, "Commediante!" the Emperor sud-

denly threw off the mask, and stormed and menaced, vowing that he would crush the Church under his heel, and pull down the Vatican on the heads of those who defied him. Pius looked up once more and muttered, "Tragediante!"

But, though his courage remained undaunted, his powers of resistance were broken down. Alone, with no one to advise him, betrayed into the belief that the clergy were eager for him to grant the concessions which would bring about a genuine reconciliation between the Empire and the Church, harassed almost into delirium, he signed the new Concordat which the Emperor presented to him. No sooner, however, was the magnetic influence of Napoleon's presence withdrawn, and the Pontiff set free from the overpowering pressure that had been exercised on him, than his presence of mind returned, and with it a sense of remorse and misery which threatened to destroy his already enfeebled reason. He refused to eat, lost his sleep utterly, and declared himself unworthy to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice. Cardinals Consalvi and Pacca obtained access to him, and reassured him by suggesting that a prompt and public retractation of the deed which had been wrenched from him in secret, and without his free agency and almost without a full knowledge of what he was doing, would repair the error, and prevent the weak and unfortunate concession from taking effect. The Pope was at once consoled by this suggestion, and, with the assistance of those able advisers, a letter was drawn up in which the recent treaty was distinctly and absolutely annulled. This letter is full of pathos, and constitutes a magnificent act of faith and humility, which reveals to us the beauty of holiness as it dwelt in the soul of Pius VII., his childlike simplicity, his entire unworldliness, the martyr-like meekness and the strength of principle which had sustained him under such long and manifold personal trials.

Napoleon felt that he was checkmated, but he concealed his anger, and endeavored through the instrumentality of Cardinal Maury to induce the Pope to recall his recantation. The attempt failed utterly. Maury was peremptorily dismissed from the Papal presence. The relative liberty which Pius VII. had, up to this period, enjoyed at Fontainebleau was now withdrawn, and his intercourse with his friends and councillors subjected to the most despotic and irritating restrictions. He had, however, regained all his wonted calmness of mind and serenity of fortitude, and now awaited his deliverance at the hands of Almighty God, satisfied to remain in bondage until His good pleasure should restore peace to His Church and liberty to His Vicar. This moment of deliverance was drawing rapidly near. Napoleon, seeing that fortune had betrayed him, and was not to be won back, that the powers of Europe, exasperated by his warfare of aggression and spoliation, had

coalesced to defeat and crush him, turned round and sought to make friends with the one solitary power that he had both wronged and robbed, and failed to conquer. He sent word to Pius VII. that he had serious thoughts of allowing him to return to Rome; but the Pope replied that these things were in the hands of Providence, and forbade the subject to be further mentioned to him.

The allied armies, meanwhile, pursued their triumphal march, and it became evident, even to Napoleon himself, that his star had set. He determined to take a last revenge on his enemies by restoring the Papal States to their lawful sovereign before they fell into possession of the powers. But this offer, which was made with an assumption of magnanimous generosity, met with cold rejection from Pius VII. He could not, he said, accept as a gift to be secured by princes or treaties, the dominions which belonged to him by right, and of which he had been unjustly despoiled.

"It may be," added the Holy Father, "that my sins have rendered me unworthy to see Rome again, but be assured that my successors will recover the whole extent of the territories which rightly belong to them." Unabashed by this rebuff, Napoleon, two months later, issued a decree announcing that the Pope was about to resume possession of the Papal States, and ordered that he should be sent back to Rome. Pius VII. immediately left Fontainebleau. But the allied armies were now in France, and it was necessary to conduct the Holy Father by a circuitous route to Savona, whence by the Emperor's orders, he was escorted under military guard to the advanced posts of the Austrian and Neapolitan forces. This took place on the 23d of March. On the 31st the allied sovereigns entered Paris. Two days later Napoleon was deposed.

The fall of Napoleon, like the death of Robespierre, came to France like the relief from a burden that had become intolerable; it was the signal for the opening of prison doors to many whose only crime had been that of standing by their principles in defiance of the despot; it was the signal for the recognition of rights that had been outraged or usurped, for the restoration of many things which had been unlawfully abolished or withdrawn; it was the signal for the Church of France to lift up her head like one from whose neck a heavy yoke had fallen.

The Restoration lost no time in proceeding to repair the evil which had been done during those memorable years—from 1801 to 1814—that the struggle had lasted between the Church of France and the Emperor. The Concordat of 1801 was set aside and that of 1516 re-established. Dioceses and parishes which had been suppressed or left vacant were reconstituted and provided with pastors; thirty sees were added to the hierarchy, thus raising

them to the number of eighty; seminaries were reopened, and an impulse given to religious activity, ecclesiastical and secular, which was hailed with joy by the Catholic heart of the nation as the dawn of a new national life.

While France was rejoicing in her deliverance, and Pius VII. giving thanks for the omnipotent mercy that had steered the bark of Peter through the tempest, Napoleon, like a lion chained to a rock in mid-ocean, was beating up and down the narrow span of his prison, uttering passionate complaints of the scant courtesy shown him by his captors. These lamentations woke no more response from the allied sovereigns than from the waves that broke upon the desolate shores of St. Helena. What claim on their pity had the tyrant who had never shown mercy to any man except when expediency or self-interest prompted him to feign it, who had overthrown dynasties, made footstools of thrones, and deluged Europe in blood for the sake of his ambition?

One sovereign alone took pity on him and lifted up a voice in his behalf. This was Pius VII. Years of cruel wrong, imprisonment, persecution and insult had left no trace of rancor in the soul of the magnanimous-hearted Pontiff. When the mother and three brothers of the deposed Emperor were compelled to fly from France after Waterloo, the Pope received them in Rome and extended to them a generous hospitality, and when, through them, he learned the sufferings of the exile, whose health was said to be impaired by the climate of St. Helena, he made an effort to obtain a change in his condition. A letter which came to light for the first time in Consalvi's memoirs, and in which the Pope pleads for the man who had so deeply wronged him, is one of the noblest and most touching examples of Christ-like benignity and forgiveness of injuries ever presented to our imitation. ". . . The pious and courageous initiative of 1801," says the Holy Father, "has caused us long ago to forget subsequent injuries. Savona and Fontainebleau are merely faults of the understanding, aberrations of human ambition; the Concordat was an act of Christian and heroic restoration. The mother and family of Napoleon have made an appeal to our compassion and generosity. . . . We are sure that we meet your wishes in charging you to write in our name to the allied sovereigns to entreat them to mitigate the sufferings of such a prisoner. It would be a source of unbounded satisfaction to us to have contributed to diminish the miseries of Napoleon. He can no longer be dangerous to any one; it is our desire that he should not be for any one a subject of remorse."

Singular and triumphant irony of fate! The Church was the sovereignty that Napoleon had most deeply wronged and most fiercely striven to overcome, and it was the only one that in the

extremity of his humiliation he could turn to for help. He had come to learn by experience that lesson which the Church has been teaching the world these eighteen hundred years, *i. e.*, that she conquers to save, not to destroy. He had warred against the Papacy, and it had defied him, standing like a fortress on a rock while the tempest raged round it, waiting in its calm strength until the word should come forth, bidding the power that had let loose the winds and put the waters in a roar, stand back, and, in its turn, bow down and do homage to a power mightier and more august. When the storm fell, and with it the enemy of the Church, the mighty Mother opened wide her arms in pardon and protection to the vanquished and prostrate foe.

AN OLD BIBLICAL PROBLEM SOLVED AT LAST.

Carmina Veteris Testamenti Metrice; Notas criticas et dissertationem de re metrica Hebræorum adjecit Dr. Gustavus Bickell. Oeniponte in libraria academiæ Wagnerianæ. 1882.

AMONG the publications, treating of Biblical Science, which in late years have appeared from the pen of Catholic authors, one of the most important and interesting is certainly the book on Hebrew Metres, which Professor Bickell, of the University of Innsbruck, has just given to the learned world.

By this work, we are convinced, a very old and difficult problem has at last found its long-desired solution. There is not, and there cannot be, any doubt that the Hebrew language, like its sister languages, the Syriac and Arabic, has the capacity of forming both metres and rhymes, for the metrical capability of the Hebrew is clearly shown by the Jewish literature of the Christian era, which contains a vast number of metrical works, not less artfully composed than some of the most celebrated Arabic poems. *Jehudæ Charisi*, for instance, has translated the well-known Makamas of Harriri into Hebrew verses, specimens of which are given by De Sacy,[1] and he himself has composed a very good Hebrew imitation of the Arabian poet in his Tachkemoni.

But it is quite another question whether the old Hebrew poets ever availed themselves of this undoubted aptitude of their lan-

[1] In his Harriri Preface.

guage, and especially whether the authors of the poetical parts of the Bible constructed their verses and strophes according to a strict metrical law or syllabic measure. Three years ago this was denied, or at least seriously questioned, by nearly all Biblical scholars. "Hebrew poetry," says Franz Delitzsch,[1] "knows only that rhythm which is the unaffected step of thought; a harmony which slips away from under all the laws by which one would bind it; a melody of language which is a charm only for those who feel it." Since that time, however, one of our greatest Orientalists has surprised the world with, as we think, evident proof of the existence of metre in Hebrew. Men of high scientific authority, like Lamy, Gutberlet, and Rohling have already declared in favor of Bickell's metrical system. But it has also been attacked severely, although not by strong arguments,[2] and the controversy is, by no means closed; on the contrary, it bids fair to be carried on perhaps with greater activity than before. Under these circumstances the present paper on the question of Biblical Metrics and its solution by Dr. Bickell may prove not unwelcome to the readers of the REVIEW, to whom we need not explain the great importance of the subject, not only in philological and literary, but also in critical, exegetical, and theological respects.

Bickell, in the introductory dissertation to his Metres, makes only a few and, according to his custom, very short remarks about the intrinsic probability and historical certainty of the existence of Hebrew metre. These, especially the testimony of the ancients, have been and are still undervalued and very frequently misunderstood. It will, therefore, not be useless to cast a glance at the *a priori* side of the question and to consider more attentively the pertinent historical tradition, before we explain the principles and give some specimens of the new metrical theory. We know full

[1] Cfr. Thalhofer Psalmen Einl. XIX. "Der Hebræische Vers ist nichts abscine gehobene, gleichsam in Musik gesetzte Prosa." Delitzsch, l. c.

[2] Among others, the following wrote against Bickell: *Dr. Schlottmann*, of the University of Halle, whose objections Bickell refuted in Z. D. M. G. (periodical of the German Oriental Society), 1879, pp. 701–706; *B. Shæfer*, in Lit. Handweiser, 1881, Nr. 281, and a certain *Dr. Jacob Eckert*, in the same periodical, 1882, Nr. 320. Cfr. also, Schuerer-Harnack, *Theol. Lit. Zeitg.*, 1880, p. 550. Among those who wrote in favor of his metrical system, besides the above-mentioned, were in Austria the Jesuits *Jo. Heller* and *Matthias Flunk*, in Zeitschr. f. Kath. Theologie, 1879, N. 1, 1882, N. 2; *P. Placidus Steininger*, O. S. B., Theol. practische Quartalschr, 1882, N. 4; in Germany, the learned interpreter, *Jos. Knabenbauer*, S. J., in his "Erklaerung des Profeten Isaias," 1882, p. v., 41; *J. Gietmann*, S. J., in Stimmen aus Maria Laach, 1882, N. 2; *Ludwig von Hœrmann*, Magazin f. d., Lit. des In-und Auslandes, 1882, N. 46, and anonymous critics in the periodical, *Theol. Lit. Blatt.*, 1882, N. 36, and *Beweis d. Glaubens*, 1882, N. 8; in England an anonymous writer in the *Athenæum*, 1879, N. 2678; finally, in France, *P. Edmund Bouvy*, O. S. Aug. (Lettres Chretiennes, 1880, N. 3, 4; 1881, N. 5, 9); and *Fr. Vigouroux*, in the *Monde*, 1882, N. 257.

well that this question cannot be decided satisfactorily by tradition, but only by the evidence shown in the sacred text itself. Still, it is nevertheless true, that theories which are entirely new meet, although sometimes without deserving it, more distrust and opposition than theories which may be satisfactorily traced to the past, and which present themselves as the reproduction, development, or improvement of older doctrines. Bickell's theory is new, so far as it is the first and only perfect metrical system comprehending all the poetry of the Old Testament, explaining it according to the philological and grammatical standpoint of our time, from which it can and even must be understood and proved without paying any attention to the statements and hypotheses previously advanced in regard to this matter. But it stands also in close connection with the ancient testimonies, which are splendidly justified and, what had never been done before, explained by it. And besides, tradition, in turn, casts the weight of its authority, whose scientific value only prejudice could ignore, into the scale, inclining it in favor of the newly broached theory, the results of which must be acknowledged also by those who cannot examine for themselves the original texts of the sacred poets.

I. The Existence of Biblical Metres is Highly Probable a Priori and by the Nature of Biblical Poetry.

First of all, very naturally arises the question, Is there nothing indubitable and *a priori* certain relative to this problem? Poetry as a fine art essentially requires, indeed, its proper sensible form, which corresponds to the poetic spirit as the body corresponds to the animating soul; but does syllabic measure belong to this essential form? Metre and rhythm flow quite naturally and, so to say, by a higher spiritual organic process, from the intrinsic power and fertility of the poetic genius; they are only the expression and external manifestation of that harmony and beauty which lie in the depth of the poetic ideal, and are vividly apprehended by the poet. As the flower from the bud these blossoms come forth, when the required conditions in human life and history, and especially if the sufficient development of language and mental culture, are present and available. Then is heard the voice of song, then arise in all nations the forms of poetry, which by imitation soon become the common recognized rules. "Man is both a Poet and a Musician by nature. The same impulse that prompted the enthusiastic Poetic style, prompted a certain melody or modulation of sound suited to the emotions of Joy or Grief, of Admiration, Love or Anger. . . . Music and Poetry had the same rise. . . . The first poets sang their own verses, and hence the beginning of what we call Versification, or words arranged in a more artistic order than

prose, so as to be suited to some tune or melody. The liberty of transposition or inversion which the Poetic style would naturally assume, made it easier to form the words into some sort of numbers that fell in with the music of the song. Very harsh and uncouth, we may easily believe, these numbers would be at first. But the pleasure was felt, it was studied, and versification, by degrees, passed into an art." In this manner one of the best and most sober English writers at the end of the last century, Hugh Blair,[1] represents the origin of poetical forms. Yet in this process of development there are many stages. What must have been the properties of poetical language, both in its primitive and in its more developed state? Certainly, poetry must have been always distinguished from the common language of daily life, not only by frequent figures and tropical expressions, by more rare words and a general more careful regard to euphony; but also by a special peculiar arrangement of syllables, words, and sentences. Hence, it is certain *a priori*, as we boldly venture to state, that true poetry, and therefore also Hebrew poetry, has never been, as some hold, a mere "poetry of things," but has been a "poetry of sounds and words" as well. A bare rhythm of thoughts had never sufficed for the essential requirements of poetical form. It must have been harmonious, melodious, rhythmical. But also metrical? No one can prove that metre is strictly essential and necessary to it. Hugh Blair asserts in the work already quoted (p. 81) that the language of poetry "is formed *most commonly* into regular numbers, because, though versification be in general the exterior distinction of poetry, yet there are some forms of verse so loose and familiar as to be hardly distinguishable from prose; such as are the verses of Terence's Comedies; and there is also a species of prose so measured in its cadence and so much raised in its tone, as to approach very near to poetical numbers, such as the Telemachus of Fenelon and the English translation of Ossian. The truth is, verse and prose, on some occasions, run into one another like light and shade. It is hardly possible to determine the exact limit where eloquence ends and poetry begins." What Blair advances here in regard to modern and classical literature, is by no means out of place in our discussion; for if we clearly see that metrical versification is not essential to every poetical production, we must also pay attention to the fact, evident in literature, that only a few kinds of poetical art-forms are excepted from the common law of metre, and these bear no resemblance to what is called Biblical poetry. It may be granted, that such a kind of poetical prose is found in the Prophets and in some other portions of the Bible. But it cannot be presumed that this intermediate form, which is generally an exception in lit-

[1] Lectures on Rhetoric, London, 1813, vol. iii., p. 84.

erature, is the predominant rule in the lyrical and didactic books of the sacred volume, and therefore in the whole of Hebrew poetry. If any species of poetry demands metre, it is assuredly the lyrical. A measured rhythm founded on the arrangement of the elementary parts of the verses and corresponding to the musical melody, seems to be necessary to the art-form of song; and whatever may have been argued to the contrary, this opinion remains highly probable, both from the very nature of the lyric in itself and—what is of the greatest weight—from universal analogy.

The common use of metre in the song is not founded on arbitrary choice or some accidental impulse. What Dr. J. Jungmann appositely remarks in his work on *Beauty and the Fine Arts*,[1] is very true. "The exercise of art depends on the liberty of man, but not its rules; these are altogether necessary laws, founded upon the nature of things." Art in its development imitates nature in some way or other, it does what it can, not absolutely of course, but relatively; that is, according as circumstances may favor. If a tree has branches and green leaves, it will also have buds and blossoms in due time. If the poetical literature of the Old Testament possesses not only that general beauty of form which is proper to true poetry, but also rhythmical harmony and a careful arrangement of the single numbers in reference to the whole, it must also possess metre.

But is not this conclusion too bold? The conditions, both subjective and objective, under which the forms of poetry are developed are so numerous, and many of them are entirely uncontrollable. What a hidden mysterious thing to us is the genius of the old languages! What great mistakes may be made here by transferring our own notions and our own taste far back into antiquity! Let us suppose some votary of song in the thirteenth century knowing, by chance, very little of Latin except a few ecclesiastical hymns, but well acquainted with the beautiful poetical effusions of his time, to ask himself whether the songs of the old Romans and Greeks were rhymed or not. He deems rhyme to be a necessary requirement of poetical language. Without consulting a better informed man, or the ancient poets themselves, he will scarcely doubt that their poems were rhymed. Are we not similarly prepossessed, judging metre to be necessary in lyrical poetry, and hence led into a similar erroneous conclusion? We opine not. For we think metre far more closely connected with the essential character of poetical, and especially lyrical, language than is rhyme.

Since the organs of voice depend for their motion upon those of respiration, human speech has always its natural *arsis* and *thesis*,

[1] Schoenheit und schoene Kunst nach den Grundsäetzen d. socrat. u christl. Phil. Innsbruck. Wagner, 1866, p. 265.

and moves itself by a continual alternation and through different degrees of tone, rising and sinking, now remaining upon a long syllable and then hastening rapidly over a short one. In common language that alternation is effected without rule or order, but in higher language it must be regular and is commonly called rhythm, so far as it insures a harmonious and a well-proportioned arrangement of words, either in prose or in poetry. In the song there is unquestionably the natural tendency to perfect the rhythm and to extend the regularity of the alternation of accented and unaccented, or long and short syllables, to the very elementary parts of the sentences. This implies a strict measure of syllables, *i. e.*, metre. Nothing can be connected more closely than rhythm and metre in the song, and we see no reason at all why this connection should have been less close, less natural in the Hebrew than in other languages. Since the time of Herder it has, indeed, been repeated a hundred times that Hebrew poetry is very simple, and in its noble simplicity it does not care much about external ornaments or the more subtle laws of art. "The thoughts," says Ewald,[1] "are sufficient to themselves and like best to stay in their own simple grandeur." Everybody will grant that Hebrew poetry has not the variety and rich external ornament of the Greek; that a psalm is very different from a tragic chorus or an ode of Pindar; but those who in asserting its simplicity go so far as to exclude every kind of metre from Hebrew poetry evidently exaggerate. Why? Is there no art in that arrangement of perfect strophes which you can very often distinguish in the translation and still more frequently, or rather always, in the original text? Take, for instance, the magnificent epinicion of Moses (Exodus xv.); what fine and exact structure of the strophes! what a perfect harmony between the single members and the whole! And the same you can see on a first attentive glance in a great many other Bible poems.

This reason seemed sufficient to Hugh Blair to assert the metrical character of Hebrew poetry. He says:[2] "There is not the least reason for doubting that the poetical works of the Bible were written in verse or some kind of measured numbers, though as the ancient pronunciation of the Hebrew language is now lost, we are not able to ascertain the nature of the Hebrew verse, or at most

---

[1] Die Poesie des hebræischen Volkes verglichen mit der anderer Voelker erscheint wie aus einem noch einfacheren, jugendlichen Zeitalter der Menschheit, von innerer Fuelle und Anmuth ueberwallend und noch wenig bekuemmert um aeusseren Schmuck und feineres Kunstgesetz. Freilich die Unbefangenheit, diese um aeussere Reitze unbekuemmerte Freiheit einer uebrigens edlen Poesie ist nur da moeglich, wo die Gedanken, welche dem Dichter entgegenkommen, von solcher Erhabenheit und Wuerde, Innigkeit und Staerke sind, dass sie sich selbst genuegen und am liebsten in ihrer einfachen Groesse bleiben.—Die poetischen Buecher d. a. Bundes, i., p. 6.

[2] L. c., p. 166, seq.

we can ascertain it but imperfectly. Taking the Old Testament in our own translation, which is extremely literal, we find plain marks of the original being written in a measured style, and the 'disjecta membra poetæ' often show themselves. Let any person read the historical introduction to the book of Job, contained in the first and second chapters, and then go on to Job's speech in the beginning of the third chapter, and he cannot avoid being sensible that he passes all at once from the region of prose to that of poetry. Not only the poetical sentiments and the figured style warn him of the change, but the cadence of the sentences and the arrangement of the words are sensibly altered; the change is as great as when he passes from reading Cæsar's Commentaries to read Virgil's Æneid."

Another, and surely not the least weighty reason favoring our opinion lies in *Parallelism.* Parallelism is a prevailing law noticeable in all the poetical passages of the Old Testament. It has often been called a "rhythm of thought." Yet it would be very wrong to understand this expression to mean that Parallelism regards only the ideas or things. Parallelism is essentially a *form of art*, regarding both the exterior and interior, matter and form of the songs; it implies an external agreement and rhythmical harmony of the members or *στίχοι*. This correspondence or equality of the parallel members is very easily explained by metrical laws. But this explanation is very difficult and perhaps impossible in the theory of the free rhythm. Parallelism shows evidently that the sacred poets had a very great and constant, and, therefore, conscious tendency to regularity. Did not this tendency influence, nay, direct them in the construction of the verses? What! Syllabic measure was the very best way to obtain the uniformity or equality of their lines, and yet they did not discover the secret, nay, they avoided it habitually, studiously, as it were of set purpose? We cannot help thinking all that highly improbable, nor can we see how this improbability would be removed by any supposed difficulty in finding out the metrical laws in the present Hebrew text. If, therefore, the Fathers not unfrequently employ the word *στιχηρὸς*, when referring to the poetical books of the Bible, we may be allowed to understand this term in the same sense in which it was understood by the Greeks, in contradistinction to prose composition, *i. e.*, in the sense of metrical versification.[2]

---

[1] St. Gregory of Nazianzen, for instance, says ad Seleucum:

Ἐξῆς στιχηρὰς πέντε σοι βίβλους ἐρῶ.
Στεφθέντος ἄεθλοις ποικίλων παεῶν Ἰώβ
Ψαλμών τε βίβλον, ἐμμελὲς ψυχῆς ἄκος,
Τρεῖς δ' αὖ Σολομῶντος τοῦ σοφοῦ, Παροιμίας
Ἐκκλησιάστην, Ἆσμα τε τῶν ἀσμάτων.

Opera Omnia, Parisiis Vivés, T. ii., p. 1103.—Fr. Epiphan.

[2] De mensuris et ponderibus. Mign. Patrol. gr. l. T. 23, p. 1134.

Hitherto we have considered Hebrew poetry only as a production of human art, and have had no regard to its higher supernatural character; for, indeed, we think the question of Biblical metrics touches the ecclesiastical doctrine of inspiration very little. For as grace generally exalts, always ennobles nature, and never destroys it, the *gratia gratis data* of inspiration raises and directs the genius of the sacred writer to higher aims, without destroying his peculiarities or hindering the connatural development and perfection of human art. However far Biblical inspiration might be held to extend in regard to the expression and external form of the inspired writings, still the influence of the primary Author of the sacred books, "who ordereth all things sweetly," certainly would not exclude or abridge the freedom of the hagiographer in following his peculiar style and structure of sentences. This we can see in each page, if not in each line of the Bible. Therefore, it is undoubtedly erroneous to hold that inspired metrical poems are an impossibility or an incongruity; and if so meritorious an interpreter as B. Schaefer[1] was inclined to maintain that incongruity, it may, indeed, surprise us, but it cannot deter any one from expecting to find Biblical metres even more artfully constructed than the Sapphic and Alcaic, which St. Jerome saw in the Old Testament.

II. The Existence of Hebrew Metres is Historically Certain.

This great probability is raised to certainty, we think, by historical tradition. The existence of a true and properly so-called metre in the poems of the Old Testament is not only sufficiently but even abundantly testified to by the ancients. *Flavius Josephus* relates that Moses composed his articles metrically,[2] and that the Psalms of David were written either in trimeters or pentameters.[3] Of no less weight is the testimony which Philo repeatedly offers in his writings, *De Vita Contemplativa*[4] and *De Vita Moysis*. In the former work he

[1] He says in Literarischer Handweiser fuer das kath. Deutschl., 1881, No. 281, "Es klingt fast komisch, dass die Inspiration des hl. Geistes sich habe in die Fesseln des Hexameters bannen lassen."

[2] Μωυσῆς ᾠδὴν εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἐγκώμιόν τε καὶ τῆς εὐμενείας εὐχαριστίαν περιέχουσαν ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ τόνῳ συντίθησιν.—Archæol. l. ii., 16, 4. . . . ποίησιν ἑξάμετρον αὐτοῖς ἀνέγνω ἣν καταλέλοιπεν ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῷ ἱερῷ πρόρησιν περιέχουσαν τῶν ἐσομένων.—Ibid., liv., 8, 44.

[3] Δαυίδης. . . . ᾠδὰς εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ ὕμνους συνετάξατο μέτρου ποικίλου. Τοὺς μὲν γὰρ τριμέτρους τοὺς δὲ πενταμέτρους ἐποίησεν.—Archæol., l. vii., 12, 3.

[4] Etiam cantica hymnosque in Dei laudem componunt vario metrorum carminumque genere rhythmis concinnatos in augustiorem et religiosam speciem.—Opera Philonis Jud. exegetica Antwerp; J. Keerberg, 1614, p. 616. . . . Praeses assurgens hymnum in laudem Dei primus canit aut recens a re compositum aut desumptum ab aliquo vatum veterum; existunt enim hujus generis carmina prisca versu trimetro et hymni cum suis accentibus inter sacra canendi ante altaria vel a stantibus vel a choreas

describes the religious assemblies of the Therapeuts and their songs, "partly composed by them, partly taken from one of the old prophets." There are such old songs composed in trimetrical measure of syllables and hymns sung according to their accents at the sacrifices before the altar. All these songs were strophically arranged. Some of them were of different metre; many of them were sung alternatively by two different choirs, or had what we call responsoria—certain verses repeated at the end of the strophes, which were sung by the whole congregation, like the responsoria in our litanies, or the Unithas in many Syriac hymns.[1]

These testimonies have often been declared worthless, and only last year Bernard Schaefer boldly asserted[2] in regard to Josephus: "Everything he says is simply false, and Josephus should not be quoted any more in this question." The same is said of Philo. But why? In other, in a hundred other, questions, these writers are treated with much more respect and less suspicion. Here we are told that they adduce neither proof nor illustration for their assertion. But we must be content that they said something about this matter, and can not expect in their writings much in regard to our doubts and difficulties. William A. Wright says in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*:[3] "The value of Philo's testimony on this point may be estimated by another passage in his works in which he claims for Moses a knowledge of numbers and geometry, the theory of rhythm, harmony, and metre, and the whole science of music, practical and theoretical." It may be that Philo is not always perfectly reliable in his account of the education of Moses at the Egyptian court, because he seems sometimes to exaggerate and follow the manner of a novelist; yet we cannot see any consequence following from that against his historical credibility in regard to facts and circumstances of which he could have and really had the evidence at his time, most probably by his own knowledge of his national language and literature. Other writers,

---

ducentibus moderatas flexibus et reflexibus. Præsulem mox imitantur ceteri decenti ordine omnibus intente et quiete auscultantibus praeterquam in fine hymni extremaque clausula; tunc enim universi vocem extollunt sine sexus discrimine. . . . (Post-cœnam.) Ubi omnis consurrexere, duo chori fiunt in medio cœnacula alter virorum alter fœminarum, cuique suus incentor præficitur, honore præstans et canendi peritus. Deinde contant hymnos in laudem Dei compositos variis metrorum carminumque generibus, nunc ore uno nunc alternis non sine decoris et religiosis gestibus atque accentibus, modo stantes modo prorsum retrorsumque gradum moventes utcunque res postulat. Denique . . . unum chorum faciunt promiscuum . . . (similiter ac Israelitæ) in rubri sinus litore accepto insigni et insperato beneficio, correpti numine viri pariter ac mulieres et in unam choream conglomerati hymnis gratias Servatori Deo canebant prorecinente viris Mose propheta Mariamne vero prophetide feminis. Ad horam maxime imitationem hic therapeutorum therapeutidumque compositus.—l. c., p. 622, *seq.*

[1] Cfr. Bickell, St. Ephraemi Carmina Nisibena, p. 32.

[2] Literarischer Handweiser f. d. kath. Deutschl., 281.

[3] Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, 1868, *sub voce* Poetry.

especially such as treat of the history of music, find not the least improbability in these statements of Philo,[1] which are confirmed by many other historical circumstances. We think, therefore, that the passage in the *Vita Moysis*,[2] far from diminishing the historical weight of Philo's testimony in his treatise on the Therapeuts, still further augments it. For what is most likely the reason that Philo attributes to Moses the knowledge of rhythm and metre? Doubtless the very contents of Genesis 49, Exodus 15, Deuteronomy 32 and 31, and other portions of the Pentateuch, in which Philo had found metrical poems.

But the most common objection is that the quoted sayings must be ascribed to the particular national tendency of these authors. Again Wright says: "Josephus and Philo labored to magnify the greatness of their own nation and to show that in literature and philosophy the Greeks had been anticipated by the Hebrew barbarians. This idea pervades all their writings."[3] How? Are we allowed to extend this suspicion quite arbitrarily to any statement of these writers which may incline to a more favorable view of Israelitic culture? We think not. There is nothing in the context nor in the form and style of those testimonies which could positively support such a suspicion. On the contrary, if they had spoken prompted only by such a tendency, they would have expressed themselves more generally, praising in vague phrases their national poetry in comparison with the Greek. They would scarcely have spoken so decidedly and determinately of definite songs and definite metres as they plainly did. Besides, Philo's treatise on the Therapeuts has always been regarded as a faithful historical source of information regarding that sect. We think, therefore, that the above-mentioned suspicion has no other foundation than the difficulty felt in bringing these ancient testimonies into harmony with the fixed prejudice that the Hebrew cannot have had a metre, otherwise it would have been found out long ago!

After these testimonies of the two most renowned Jewish writers, comparatively near the time when the Hebrew was a living language, writers so well acquainted with their own language that they wrote Hebrew books, we must find it natural that the Christian teachers of the first centuries were of the same opinion on this subject. It is wrong to explain the sayings of the Christian writers only by their dependence on Josephus or Philo. Some of them, and even those who exercised the greatest influence and were of remarkable authority in such questions, were very well acquainted with Hebrew. As we learn by St. Jerome, the great

[1] For instance, Aug. Wilh. Ambros, the ingenious author of the Geschichte der Music; Breslau, 1862, p. 165.

[2] Philonis Opera, p. 421.

[3] Diction. of the Bible, l. c.

Origenes, the father of critical and exegetical science, attests the metrical character of Hebrew poetry. In that he seems only to follow the opinion of his most learned predecessor at the School of Alexandria; for Clemens Alex. (Strom., vi., c. 11), thinks the forms of the old Doric hymns to be even imitations of the Psalms of David. "We may regard," he writes, "David as an exemplar (*παράδειγμα*) of musical art; for he is both singer and prophet, and praises God in harmonious songs. . . . . So the harmony of the Hebrew psaltery became quite a model for Terpander for his Doric melody."[1] And, then, in order to confirm his assertion, he quotes a passage from Terpander, which is the more interesting as it bears a striking resemblance to the trochaic hexasyllabic metre occurring, according to Professor Bickell, very frequently in the Psalter. It is historically certain that Terpander collected many foreign, and especially Asiatic, melodies and applied them to Greek songs.[2] The Doric melody had a solemn religious character. *Τῆς Δωρίου* (*ἁρμονίας*) *τὸ σεμνόν*, says Lucian.

Clement speaks directly here of the melody, but does he not presuppose also metrical analogy or similarity, according to common Greek notions? There is no *melos* without metre. We may remember that Josephus speaks of the *ἑξάμετρος τόνος*, which signifies both metrical and musical rhythm and tone. But, what is more remarkable is that the song quoted really shows a metrical agreement with the Hebrew hymns.

Ζεῦ πάντων ἀρχά,—
πάντων ἀγῆτος,
Ζεῦ σοι πέμπω—
ταῦταν ὕμνων ἀρχάν!

Let the reader compare these spondees with the trochees in Psalm iv., 1–2, which Bickell scans in the following manner: ´ _ | ´ _ | ´ _ |

Lámma rág'shu góyim
Úl'ùmmím jehgú rig?
Titjaçç'bu mal'khè arz
Vróz'nim nós'du jáchad.

---

[1] Ἔτι τῆς μουσικῆς παράδειγμα ψάλλων ὁμοῦ καὶ προφητεύων ἐκκείθω Δαβὶδ ὑμνῶν τὸν θεὸν ἐμμελῶς. . . . . Ἡ τοίνυν ἁρμονία τοῦ βαρβάρου ψαλτηρίου τὸ σέμνον ἐμψαίνουσα τοῦ μέλους ἀρχαιοτάτη τυγχάνουσα ὑπόδειγμα Τερπάνδρῳ μάλιστα γίνεται πρὸς ἁρμονίαν τὴν Δώριον. ὑμνῶν τὸν Δία ὧδέ πως.

Ζεῦ παντῶν ἀρχά, παντῶν ἀγῆτος,
Ζεῦ σοι πέμπω ταῦταν ὕμνων ἄρχαν!

—Clement Alex. Opera, Lugd. Bat., 1616, p. 474.

[2] Cfr. Ambros Musicgesch., Breslau, 1862, p. 248. Emil Naumann, Musicg., Stuttg., 1880, p. 120.

The omitted auxiliary vowel in ארץ need not disturb anybody. Also Origenes writes קרן for *κερν*.

Eusebius, the Father of Church History, expresses himself very decidedly on this subject. He says, in his *Præparatio Evangelica*, xi., c. 5: "The Hebrews also have their metrically composed works; for instance, that great canticle of Moses and the 118th Psalm of David, both of which contain the metre that the Greek call heroic, for they say that these poems consist of hexameters of sixteen syllables. Their other songs are believed to be composed in trimeters and tetrameters, *according to the nature of their language*."

In the fourth century, or rather throughout the whole of antiquity, there are heard, as it seems, only two voices gainsaying the statements alleged. The first is no great authority, either in literary or historical matters, viz., Cæsar Julianus, the Apostate, who remarks against the testimony of the learned bishop of Cæsarea: "Among the Hebrews there were neither laws of state nor a form of judgment, nor any practice of the fine arts, except a very miserable and barbarous one, although that rascal Eusebius makes them have some kind of hexameters."

Besides, St. Gregory of Nyssa is quoted also by W. A. Wright, *l. c.*, as a decided adversary of Hebrew metre. But what does he say? St. Gregory, in his interesting treatise on the Inscriptions of the Psalms, *denies* that the sacred songs were artfully arranged like the works of the heathen poets, like the classical songs.[1] If this saint had really denied the existence of metre in the original text of the Psalms, his opinion would not be of great weight, because it is too singular and in opposition to older and stronger testimonies. But he does not deny anything of the kind about our subject. It is not necessary to say, as some[2] have said, that the holy doctor excludes only the metres of classical art, as, for instance, such ones as were founded on quantity of syllables. St. Gregory does not speak at all here of the Hebrew text. This is clearly shown by the context of the passage cited. What, asks he at the beginning of the third

---

[1] Neque enim hoc levi brachio prætereundum est, nempe, has nostras melodias non esse factas eo modo, quo externorum et a nostra disciplina alienorum carmina condita sunt; nam melos et modulus in dictionum sonora serie non consistit; quemadmodum apud illos videre licet, quibus rhythmus conficitur ex accentuum apta compositione, tono in sonis nunc elevato, nunc depresso, nunc breviato, nunc producto; sed nullo studio quæsitum comparatumve divinis verbis *melos* innectitur, quod ipsa vocis confirmatione secundum intensionem et compositionem subjectum verbis sensum quoad fieri potest revelat.—Mign. Patrol. gr. l. T. 24, p. 252.

[2] Cfr. Natalis Alex. in iv. mundi ætatem; Laurentius Veith, Mign. S. S. Curs. T. iv., p. 585.

chapter of his treatise,[1] what is the cause of the great pleasure which all—young and old, men and women, churchmen and laymen—commonly find in the Psalms? One cause, he says, is natural and is at once discovered,—the sweet melody and musical modulation of these sacred songs. This musical character was given to the Psalms already by their inspired author, David, and, we may add, it has been preserved in some way also by the Church using the translated text. There is a great mystery in music, continues St. Gregory. The ancient wise men knew that well. He refers to Pythagoras, and applies ingeniously his characteristic musico-philosophical principles to Christian ethics. Music symbolizes and reveals to the human heart the harmony of the universe, established by God himself. The Psalms especially, with "the veiled riddle of their melody," signify the harmony of a virtuous life. For that purpose the Psalms are the more fit, as it is very easy to understand and remember their melody. For it is not so artful as the melody of the Greek songs, and is in its noble simplicity very much adapted to express the edifying sense of the Psalms by a fit accentuation and harmonious modulation of the voice. The question whether the Hebrew text was metrical or not, is here quite out of place. The rhythm of which St. Gregory speaks is chiefly the *ῥυθμὸς μελωδίας*, the musical, and the *ῥυθμὸς λέξεως*, the rhythm of words only so far as it is necessary to the expression of the sense, but by no means as far as it is connected with metre. That, of course, would be an absurdity in regard to the Greek text. The ancients were used to distinguish accurately metre and rhythm, and rhythm of words and sounds (*φθόγγος*).[2] Therefore this passage of St. Gregory of Nyssa, the only one, as it seems, sometimes quoted against Biblical metre, does not prove anything against it; it may be interesting for the history of song, but it has nothing to do with the metrical question.

But the chief authority in this matter, upon which the tradition of the Christian schools relied for many centuries, is *St. Jerome*. Long before he went to live in Palestine this Saint had learned Hebrew from a native Jew in the Chalcidic Desert, and afterwards while living in Bethlehem he improved his knowledge of that language

[1] Tam vero et convivia et nuptiales hilaritates philosophiam hanc (scil. Psalmorum) ut partem lætitiæ, suis jucunditatibus adsciscunt ut taceamus divinam illam in nocturnis pervigiliis per psalmos institui solitam hymnodiam ecclesiæque in his decantandis accuratam sedulitatem. Quæ igitur causa ineffabilis illius voluptatis, qua cantus suos magnus David perfudit? . . . Fortasse cuivis promptum fuerit causam dicere. . . . verborum melodiam aptamque concinnitatem. L. c., p. 250.

[2] Aristides Quintilianus says, I., 31, apud Ambros' Musikgeschichte, p. 405: *ῥυθμίζεται δὲ ἐν μουσικῇ κίνησις σώματος, μελωδία, λέξις,* Cfr. also Aristoteles de anima, I., 4: *Μουσικὴ δὲ ὀξεῖς ἅμα καὶ βαρεῖς, μακροῦς δὲ καὶ βραχεῖς φθόγγους μίξασα ἐν διαφόροις φωναῖς μίαν ἀπετέλεσεν ἁρμονίαν.* St. Gregory characterizes the more recitative character of the ecclesiastical psalmody.

in a high degree. His translation of the Old Testament is acknowledged as a masterpiece, "which surpasses all other ancient versions by its accuracy and fidelity."[1] As we learn from his Preface to the Book of Job, he consulted the most renowned teachers among the Jews and had regard also to the other Semitic languages, Chaldaic, Syriac, and Arabic. By his Hebrew teachers he became well acquainted with many valuable traditions of the Rabbinical schools, traces of which we frequently discover in his writings,—most probably also when he approaches our subject. As we see from the Preface to Jeremias, he tried himself to elaborate a metrical translation of the Lamentations, and his diligent and pious disciple St. Paula was used to sing the psalms in Hebrew "without the accent and peculiarities of her mother tongue." If, therefore, the testimony of any one of the Fathers is very reliable, it must be that of St. Jerome, whose erudition, conferences with the Jews, and great interest in special studies on this question, give to his opinion a great weight both philologically and historically. In the Preface to Job,[2] he states first the existence of a regular metre in this poem, which he says mostly resembles classical hexameters, although not quite corresponding with Greek or Latin metres, on account of the different character of the Hebrew language. According to his opinion, only sometimes and by exception, there occurs a kind of a free rhythm, instead of the regular metre generally observed. Then he confirms his assertion by the remark that there are metres in nearly all the poetic parts of the Bible, which is testified to also by the authorities already quoted. It is strange that B. Schaefer could see in this passage a confirmation of what he thinks to be "the truth," viz., the system of free rhythm, which St. Jerome expressly calls an *exception*, occasionally found in Job. There is no doubt St. Jerome thought the Hebrew poetry to be properly metrical, whatever his metrical system may have been. This is evident also by what he says in the

[1] As the Protestant Keil says, Hist. Crit. Einleitung ins A. T.

[2] Memini me ob intelligentiam hujus voluminis, Lyddæum quendam præceptorem qui apud Hebræos primus haberi putabatur, non parvis redemisse nummis; cujus doctrina an aliquid profecerim, nescio; hoc unum scio, non potuisse ne interpretari, nisi quod autem intellexerim. A principio itaque voluminis usque ad verba Job, in quibus ait, pereat dies in qua natus sum et nox in qua dictum est conceptus est homo, usque ad eum locum, ubi ante finem voluminis scriptum est: Id circo ipse me reprehendo et ago pœnitentiam in favilla et cinere hexametri versus sunt, dactylo spondæloque currentes et propter *linguæ idioma* crebro recipientes et alios pedes non earundum syllabarum sed eorundem temporum. *Interdum* quoque rhythmus ipse dulcis et tinnulus fertur numeris pedum solutis, quod metrici magis quam simplex lector intelligunt. . . . . quod si cui videtur incredulum metra scilicet esse apud Hebræos et in morem nostri Flacci græcique Pindari et Alcæi et Sappho vel Psalterium vel Lamentationes Jeremiæ vel omnia ferme scripturarum cantica comprehendi legat Philonem, Josephum, Origenem, Cæsarium, Eusebium et eorum testimonio me verum dicere comprobabit.—Præfatio in Job.

Preface to the Chronicon of Eusebius,[1] and in the Epist. xxx. ad Paulam relating to the Alphabetic Songs.[2]

Some understood the terms here used by the holy doctor (Hexameter, Alcaic, Sapphic, etc.) in the strict meaning of classical Greek or Latin metres. Such a mistake, of course, must naturally have led them to hold that the statements of Josephus as well as that of St. Jerome were based upon mere imagination, and hence were entirely wrong. Whereas St. Jerome obviously meant only a certain resemblance and not an exact similarity to the classical metres. For, like Eusebius, he pointedly reminds the reader of the peculiar character of the Hebrew (linguæ idioma, cfr. the quoted passage of the Preface to Job). He says that the first and second Lamentations of Jeremias are composed in *quasi* Sapphic metre. Why? Because three verses are concluded by an *heroic comma, i. e.*, by a dactyl and trochees or spondees, like the heroic verse or hexameter. From what he says in the Ep. xxx. ad Paulam we think that he arranged, for instance, Threni I., 1 seq., as follows:

Ekha yasheba badad rabbatí 'am,
Hayeta kealmana rabbati baggoim
Sarati behammedinot——
Hāyĕtā lāmmās!

Bickell shows that the Lamentations are written in trochaic verses of twelve syllables, which metre appears also in some Psalms (136, 119), and in the Prophets, and even Jeremias (18, 13–17; 12, 7–12; 50, 23–29). He scans:

---

[1] Quid Psalterio canorius quod in morem nostri Flacci et græci Pindari nunc jambo currit nunc Alcaico personat nunc Sapphico tumet nunc semipede ingreditur? Quid Deuteronomii et Isaiæ cantico pulchrius? Quid Salomone gravius? Quid perfectius Job? Quæ omnia Hexametris et Pentametris versibus, ut Josephus et Origines scribunt, apud suos composita decurrunt. Hæc cum græce legimus aliud quiddam sonant, cum latine penitus non hærent.—Præfatio in Chron. Euseb. Mign. Patrol., T. xxviii., p. 128.

[2] Priusquam de singulis disseram, scire debes, quatuor psalmos secundum ordinem Hebræorum incipere elementorum, centesimum decimum et centesimum undecimum et hunc, de quo nunc scribimus (118) et centesimum quadragesimum quartum. Verum debes scire in prioribus psalmis, singulis litteris singulos versiculos, qui trimetro jambico constant esse subnexos. Inferiores vero tetrametro jambico constare, sicuti et Deuteronomii canticum scriptum est. In centesimo decimo octavo psalmo singulas literas octoni versus sequuntur. In centesimo quadragesimo quarto singulis litteris singuli versus gemini deputantur. Sunt qui et alios hoc ordine putent incipere, sed falsa eorum opinio est. Habes et in lamentationibus Jeremiæ quatuor Alphabeta e quibus duo prima quasi Sapphico metro scripta sunt, quia tres versiculos, qui sibi connexi sunt et ab una tantum litera incipiunt, heroici comma concludit. Tertium vero Alphabetum trimetro scriptum est et alternis literis, sed iisdem terni versus incipiunt. Quartum Alphabetum simile est primo et secundo. Proverbia quoque Salomonis extremum claudit Alphabetum, quod tetrametro jambico supputatur ab eo loco, in quo ait: Mulierem fortem quis inveniet.—Mign. Patrol., T. xxii., p. 442.

Ékha yásh'ba bádad háir rábbatí 'am,
Háyetá k'almána rábbatí baggóyim
Sáratí behámmedínot hâỳ'ta lámmas.

It would be unwarranted to presuppose that St. Jerome could not have had any notion of metres, based not exclusively on the quantity of the syllables, but on the accentuation. He certainly knew the accentuated hymns of the Greek Church; besides, he was very well acquainted with Plautus, who was long his favorite author in hours of recreation, and whose versification is very different from that of Virgil or Ovid, in that it follows the accent and pronunciation of popular language.

From all this we conclude that a certain traditional knowledge of the old Hebrew metres had been preserved down to the fourth and fifth centuries, when the metrical character of Hebrew poetry was generally maintained by scholars, as we learn from St. Augustine.[1] In some way, however, this knowledge had lost its accuracy, as we can easily see by comparing the metres of Bickell with the statements of St. Jerome.

But we find, although indirectly, the latest trace of this knowledge in the celebrated Syriac school of Nisibis in a passage from Junilius, an African bishop in the sixth century. This father wrote a kind of introduction to the Bible (*De partibus legis divinæ*). In the ninth chapter of the second book of this work he treats of our subject in his peculiar manner: "D. (discipulus) Modi scripturæ divinæ quot sunt? M. (magister) Duo. Nam aut metris hebraicis in sua lingua conscribuntur aut oratione simplici. D. Quæ sunt metris conscripta? M. Ut[2] Psalmi et Jobi historia et Ecclesiastes et in Prophetis quædam. D. Quæ simplici oratione conscripta sunt? M. Reliqua omnia. D. Quare apud nos iisdem metris conscripta non sunt? M. Quia nulla dictio metrum in alia lingua conservat, si vim verborum ordinemque non mutet."[3]

Now, Junilius tells us (præf. lii., ad Primasium) that his chief authority in Biblical matters were the instructions obtained from a certain Paulus, a native Persian. The work of Junilius is almost a copy of what Paulus had taught and dictated to his disciples. But this Paulus had studied in the school of Nisibis, "where the divine law was taught by public teachers, according to a certain method and rule, just as among the Romans grammar and rhetoric

[1] Quibus numeris constent versus Davidici non scripsi, quia nescio. Neque enim ex hebræa lingua, quam ignoro, potuit etiam numeros interpres exprimere, ne metri necessitate ab interpretandi veritate amplius quam ratio sententiarum sinebat digredi cogeretur, certis tamen constare numeris credo illis qui illam linguam probe callent.—Ep. 103, ad Memorium episcopum.

[2] The text is corrupted. We may read perhaps: opera poetica, or carmina ut, etc.

[3] Mign., T. 68, p. 19.

were taught in secular schools," as Cassiodorus[1] says. Therefore we hear through Junilius the teaching of the most renowned Syriac school. Bickell shows that the metrical laws in the Syriac are nearly the same as in the Hebrew. Hence it was very natural that the knowledge of Hebrew metres was preserved the longest among the Syrians.

This unanimous agreement of Christian antiquity, founded, as we have seen, upon the testimony of even the greatest authorities in Biblical science among the Fathers, was naturally concurred in by the Christian schools of the following centuries and by the theologians. From Cassiodorus[2] to Cornelius à Lapide and Bossuet,[3] the metrical character of Hebrew poetry was the *sententia communis*, with no or very few exceptions. One of the first adversaries who arose against it was Joseph Scaliger, who attacked the statements of St. Jerome,[4] but was refuted by Martianay, the learned editor of St. Jerome's works. Richardus Simon denied every regularity of external form in the Bible poems (*Hist. crit. du V. T.*). The rabbins, at least from the end of the Middle Ages, also denied the existence of Biblical metres.[5] The more the study of Oriental languages, and especially of the Hebrew, was cultivated, the more frequent became the doubts in regard to this point. Already Calmet speaks very skeptically and thinks it impossible to find out the nature of Hebrew poetry.[6]

The worst of all was, that every attempt[7] to define and establish

---

[1] Migne, l. c., p. 15. [2] Migne, T. 70, p. 20.

[3] Migne, S. S. C., T. 15, p. 1052.

[4] Scaliger animadversionibus in Chronicon Eusebii Sanctum Hieronymum censoria virgula notat negatque in Psalterio ullum canticum esse metricis regulis adstrictum aut in Hebraico idiomate ullam metri speciem concipi posse, quia id natura sermonis non patiatur (!). Scaligerum viri eruditi pro meritis castigarunt inter alios Pfeiferus. Scaligero præivit Julianus.—Natalis Alex. hist. eccl. in iv. mundi æt. dissert.

[5] But Genebrardus testifies in Chronic. ad. an. mundi., 1306: "Hoc unum Hebræi agunt in tractatu Sopherim versus carminum biblicorum non paucos in suum statum *juxta mensuræ rationem* a scribis restitutos esse, cum antea fuissent a librariis confuse et permixte scripti."—Migne, S. S., T. iv., p. 586.

[6] He writes in regard to Job: "Hujus poesis metrum omnino nos latet et quanquam rhythmi vestigium aliquid referre videatur, utrum rhythmum semper servaverit certisque syllabarum numeris adstricta fuerit, certo pronuntiari non potest. Denique hebraicæ linguæ peritia et genuina ejus pronuntiandi ratio majori ex parte periit, quare nemo sibi, quantumvis eruditus blandiri jure meritoque potest sese certi aliquid de natura poeseos veterum Hebræorum assecutum esse."—Migne, S. S. C., T. 12, p. 265, n. 2.

[7] One of the earliest was the theory of Gomarus, Professor at Groeningen (David's Lyra, Lugd. Bat., 1637), who attributed both metre and rhyme to the Psalms. Marcus Meibomius (about 1700) offered the mystery of Hebrew metrics, revealed to him by God, as he imagined, to the English government for 150,000 dollars, but found no purchaser, but a severe chastisement by contemporaneous scholars. Wetzel tried to scan the Centicam Mosis triumphale, Erlangen, 1758. Anton, Conjectur. de Metro Hebr., Lips. 1770. Lautwein, Versuch einer richtig., Theor. v. d. bibel., Verskunst. Tueb., 1775 (both accentuating). W. Jones, Comment. Poes. Asiat., 1774. Greve,

the laws of versification in the traditional Hebrew text had failed. The most significant of all these attempts in the past century had been made by Francis Hare, Bishop of Chichester. He published his "Psalmorum liber in versiculos metrice divisus" in London, 1736. It is remarkable that he had already seen some important laws of Hebrew metrics,[1] which are now proved by Bickell. But his metrical arrangement of the Psalms was rejected as unsatisfactory, arbitrary and inconsistent with itself. His attempt was criticised also by R. Lowth in an appendix to the renowned work "De sacra Poesi Hebræorum prælectiones" (Oxon., 1753).

This celebrated author had found, in the meantime, a very good touchstone and criterion of every metrical system in parallelism, whose laws and character were first clearly set forth by him. By that criterion it was easy to show that the metric systems hitherto proposed were faulty; but although he had thrown away every hope of a possible satisfactory solution of the metrical problem, he nevertheless maintained the credibility of attention having been paid to numbers or feet in the compositions of the sacred poets. We are convinced that if Lowth had seen the metres of Bickell and their perfect agreement with parallelism, he would have received them joyfully. It must surely be ascribed to the scientific moderation of Lowth, that among the English authors, the respect for the sayings of the ancients was not lost so soon and so generally as it was in Germany, and still many believed in the existence of a Hebrew metre. The same was the case in France. La Harpe says in his "Discours préliminaire sur les Psaumes," "La poésie des Hébreux a généralement les caractères que dut avoir la poésie dans sa première origine chez tous les peuples qui l'ont cultivée. Née de l'imagination (car il ne s'agit pas encore de l'inspiration divine) elle est élevée, forte et hardie. Il est certain qu'elle était métrique, mais les Hébreux mêmes ignorent aujourd hui qu'elle etait la nature du métre. Le mot de leur langage qui répond au carmen des Latins (mismôr), au vers des François, offre proprement l'idée d'un discours coupé en phrases concises et mesurées par des intervalles distincts." (Discours prélim. sur les Psaumes,

---

Ultima capita Jobi, etc., 1791, tried to apply the Arabic versification to Hebrew, but vainly. Bellermann, Versuch. ueber d. M. d. Hebr., 1813. Morensystem. Cfr. W. A. Wright, l. c.

[1] "Bishop Hare maintained that in Hebrew poetry *no regard was had to the quantity of syllables*. He regarded Shevas as long vowels and long vowels as short, at his pleasure." Among the rules which he laid down are the following: In Hebrew poetry *all the feet are dissyllables and no regard is had to the quantity of a syllable.* Clauses consist of an equal or unequal number of syllables. *If the number of syllables be equal the verses are trochaic; if unequal, jambic.* Periods for the most part consist of two verses, three or four, sometimes more. Clauses of the same periods are of the same kind, that is, either jambic or trochaic, with very few exceptions. Cfr. Wright, l. c.

Migne, S. S., T. 14, p. 1052.) The traditional opinion was defended in Germany also, and the learned Jesuit Laurentius Veith calls it sententia communis (Migne, S. S., T. 4, p. 585). But on the other hand, the contrary opinion, *i. e.*, the theory of free rhythm, gained more and more defenders, owing mainly to the repeated failures of various metrical attempts, and was widely spread through the influence of Herder. In his "Geist der hebræischen Poesie," he exceeded the bounds of the prudent moderation of Lowth and boldly asserted that "the poetry of the Psalms had evidently only free measures[1] of syllables and allowed of little or no scanning, as now understood after our notion." "Free metric regions," he continued, "are hovering in the air (!), melody and affection generally determine their measure and changes, which is indicated by the frequent-occurring Sela."

Such expressions and phrases were repeated afterwards in numberless variations, some of which remind us of Goethe's words:

> Eben wo Begriffe fehlen
> Da stellt ein Wort zur rechten Zeit sich ein.

Of course certain scholars felt themselves not at all embarrassed how to explain that supposed peculiarity or deficiency in Hebrew poetry. Were the Israelites so far from the state of semi-barbarism? Others appeal to some kind of extraordinary earnest and severity of the Biblical writers, partly caused by the Mosaic religion, partly arising from a supposed special property of their national temperament.[2] Neither must we wonder that even infidelity and atheism tried to profit by that circumstance and to blame religion and faith in God for that supposed want in the literature of Israel! whereas theological and dogmatical reasons were alleged by some conservative scholars. Some thought metrical composition less compatible with inspiration, as we have heard already. Jebb, in his *Sacred Literature*, thus ventured another explanation, or rather *a priori* deduction of the non-existence or incongruity of metrical composition in the Holy Scriptures: "Hebrew poetry is universal poetry,—the poetry of all languages and of all peoples. The collocation of words (whatever may have been the sound, for of this we are quite ignorant), is primarily directed to secure the best possible announcement and discrimination of the sense. Let, then, a trans-

[1] Geist. h. Poesie., Wien, 1820, p. 378.—Here he was in some contradiction with himself, for at the beginning of the quoted work, his Euthyphron speaks more cautiously: "Ist nicht der Parallelism das simpelste Ebenmas in den Gliedern der Gedichte, Bildern und Toenen? Die Silben wurden noch nicht genau scandirt und nicht gemessen *nicht einmal ueberall* gezæhlt. Aber die Symmetrie ist in ihnen auch dem bloedesten Ohr vernehmbar." P. 33.

[2] J. Scherr says, in his notorious Allg. Literaturgesch: "Der Monotheismus der Hebraer hat der Hebræischen Literatur den Character der Monotonie verliehen."

lator only be literal, and, so far as the genius of his language will permit, let him preserve the original order of the words, and he will infallibly put the reader in possession of all, or nearly all, that the Hebrew text can give to the best Hebrew scholar of the present day.

"Now, had there been metre originally, the case, it is presumed, could hardly have been such. Something must have been sacrificed to the opportunities of metrical necessity; the sense could not have invariably predominated over the sound, and the poetry could not have been, as it unquestionably and emphatically is, a poetry, not of sounds or of words, but of things. Let not this last assertion, however, be misinterpreted. I would be understood merely to assert that sound, and words in subordination to sound, do not in Hebrew, as in classical poetry, enter into the essence of the thing; but it is happily undeniable that the words of the poetical Scriptures are exquisitely fitted to convey the sense, and it is highly probable (!) that in the lifetime of the language the sounds were sufficiently harmonious. When I say sufficiently harmonious, I mean so harmonious as to render the poetry grateful to the ear in recitation and suitable to musical accompaniment, for which purpose the cadence of well-modulated prose would fully answer, a fact which will not be controverted by any person with a moderately good ear, that has ever heard a chapter of Isaiah skilfully read from our authorized translation, that has ever listened to one of Kent's anthems well performed, or to a song from the Messiah of Handel." (!) By the expression "universal poetry," Jebb could not have meant anything else but the design of the Bible, as destined for the religious and moral instruction of mankind; for to this end were directed the poetical parts of the Bible, as well as those which are written in prose. But it is not difficult to see that Jebb extended that expression too far, viz., beyond the wants and limits of doctrinal instruction, to which the sacred books are destined, but as a means, yet neither as the only one, nor as the first and principal one. Besides, it is clear that the universal aim of the Bible, which Jebb presupposes, stands in close connection with that peculiar Protestant theory of the perspicuity and sufficiency of the Bible, in the advocacy of which some former Protestant scholars, as, for instance, John Buxtorf, senior, have extravagantly demanded the primitive existence and absolute correctness of the masoretic punctuation! This theory being but a bare, arbitrary, sectarian prejudice, the explanation of Jebb is as little satisfactory as the other ones above-mentioned. In short, against the existence of Hebrew metre, no objective reason can be alleged, no testimony, no fact, no quality of language; only the difficulty of finding it out experienced in all the metrical attempts hitherto

made. This objection being removed, nothing could be adduced against the Hebrew metre except, perhaps, some principle, which many would call prepossession, or compare to a rather subjective rule, ascribed to a certain class of European bureaucrats: *Quod non est in actis, non est in mundo.*

But this difficulty is now removed. Already, on the 2d February, 1879, a competent Orientalist wrote in the *Athenæum*, of London, reviewing Bickell's first metrical specimens, as follows: "We agree with the writer, that the Psalms and many other poetical pieces of the Old Testament are, without doubt, of metrical composition. We cannot see, indeed, why the Hebrew should form an exception in this regard to all other nations. But, whether Dr. Bickell has found the key to the rhythmical system in the Bible we cannot decide, till we see his system adapted with some regularity to all poetical pieces of the Old Testament."

Bickell has given this proof in the most complete and satisfactory manner, as we hope to show in another article.

FATHER FELIX VARELA,

VICAR GENERAL OF NEW YORK FROM 1837 TO 1853.

WHOEVER has paid a visit to the Catholic Cemetery of St. Augustine, Florida, generally known among the people of that city by the name of "Tolomato," or "Tolomato Cemetery," will remember with pleasure, not unmixed with emotion, the pretty little chapel erected in its grounds by the Cubans to shelter the remains of their fellow-countryman, Father Varela, and perpetuate his memory.

The eloquent Father Baker, who had visited this chapel, alludes to it in one of his sermons,[1] and after paying deserved praise both to the beauty of the monument and to the goodness of the spirit which prompted its erection, found occasion to speak of the "holy and learned Cuban priest, who spent his whole life in the service of God and men, and who was at all times a perfect model of apostolic zeal and boundless charity."

The corner-stone of this beautiful monument was laid on the 22d of March, 1853, with imposing ceremonies, an account of which, printed in Charleston,[2] has preserved and transmitted to us the funeral oration delivered there by Rev. J. F. O'Neill, of Savannah, Ga., and the discourse of Don José Maria Casal, the Cuban delegate, who on behalf of his countrymen had purchased the ground and provided the means to build the chapel and the tomb.

The writer of this article, a pupil of Father Varela, actuated by a feeling of gratitude and patriotism, and by the more practical wish of recalling to the memory of the Cuban people the fruitful example of private and public virtue given by the great priest, and preventing his teachings from being lost at the very critical moment of the political reconstruction of the country, after the convulsions of the struggle through which Cuba had passed, undertook to write his life. It appeared in Spanish, in 1878.[3] The reception of the book, however undeserving as a literary performance, showed that the generous noble-minded youth of the island of Cuba, to whom it was dedicated, were not insensible to

[1] Sermons of Rev. Father A. Baker, with a Memoir of his Life, by Rev. A. F. Hewitt.

[2] Ceremonies at the laying of the corner-stone of a chapel in the Roman Catholic Cemetery in the City of St. Augustine, Florida, dedicated to the memory of the Very Rev. Felix Varela, D.D., late Vicar-General of New York, who died on Friday, Feb. 25, 1853. Charleston: Printed by Councell & Phinney, 119 East Bay. 1853.

[3] Vida del Presbitero Don Felix Varela, por José Ignacio Rodriguez. Nueva York: Imprente de "O Novo Mondo," 39 Park Row, Times Building. 1878.

the appeal, and that the author, himself born in that privileged land, had struck upon a chord of feeling which cannot fail to produce good results.

A short synopsis of this book, by the lamented Father Finotti, was published in the *Catholic Telegraph*, of Cincinnati, Ohio, October 3, 1878, while other notices of it, published in sections of the country where the Spanish language is more generally known and spoken, extended the circulation of the work beyond the sphere for which it was specially intended.

But the influence which Father Varela exercised upon the development of Catholic interests in this country—where he arrived in 1823, poor and proscribed—and the love with which his memory has been preserved and cherished, as well in New York, among the people of the parish he founded and in which he exercised his sacred ministry, as in Florida, where he closed his life and labors, have been too great not to justify us in presenting to the readers of this QUARTERLY the most distinctive features of the character of that illustrious man.

From the day on which the first mass was said within the chapel of the cemetery, April 13, 1853, up to this time, a committee of five ladies, selected among the Catholic families of St. Augustine, have been in the habit of paying a visit to Father Varela's tomb every Monday afternoon; and the writer of this article has seen in New York several persons who still preserve as sacred relics a little piece of his cassock or a lock of his hair. He knows one gentleman in Harlem who undertakes every year a kind of pilgrimage to the city of St. Augustine and pays a visit to the tomb of his friend and confessor.

Father Varela was born in Havana, Cuba, on the 20th of November, 1788. He was baptized by the chaplain of the regiment to which his father and grandfather belonged, the former as a lieutenant and the latter as the lieutenant-colonel, and received at the baptismal font the names of *Félix Francisco José Maria de la Conception.*

When Felix Varela was a child, public education in Cuba was entirely in the hands of the Church. Latin, Logic, Philosophy in all branches, Theology were taught, *always gratuitously*, in the convents of Saint Francis, Saint Dominic, Saint Augustine, and others; and the Fathers of the order of Saint Jerome at Belen maintained primary schools, the only public ones in the island, where children of all classes and conditions, white and black, poor and rich, free and slave, were admitted *gratuitously*, and taught reading, writing, and Christian doctrine, and the four elementary rules of arithmetic. Books and paper, pens and ink, slates, etc., were furnished *gratuitously* to those who could not pay.

While here in the United States, in our advanced state of civilization, under republican institutions, the idea of "mixed schools," where a negro child can be seated on the same benches as the white one, is not yet relished, in Cuba, in 1793, under monarchical rule, in a thoroughly aristocratic atmosphere, where no man had yet ventured to make a bill of rights, or any declaration of principles,—religion, holy religion, Roman Catholic religion, through the instrumentality of her monks and friars, spreading her merciful mantle over all classes of society, protected all alike without opposition, and afforded to all without distinction and *without pay* all the means that she possessed to raise up their hearts and enlighten their minds.

According to the obituary notice of Father Varela, which the New York *Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register* published March 19, 1856, his vocation for the sacred ministry was clearly shown from the very first days of his childhood. The writer says that the young Felix Varela, when scarcely fourteen years of age, declined a cadetship which was offered him in recognition of the services of his father and his grandfather, and that he accompanied his refusal with the statement: "I wish to be a soldier of Jesus Christ. My desire is not to kill men, but to save souls."

He was admitted at about that time, as a day scholar, in the seminary attached to the Cathedral of Havana; and there he completed his course of Latin, Philosophy, and Humanities, becoming in a short time the favorite son of that institution.

This *seminary*, founded in 1769, and always kept under the control of the Church, was the most brilliant and most fruitful educational institution that ever flourished in Cuba. Its history is connected intimately with all that has been grand, and noble, and advanced, and progressive in the culture of the country, and its high degree of intellectual development. The pupils were gratuitously and thoroughly instructed in rhetoric, the Latin language and literature, mathematics, logic, metaphysics and ethics, natural philosophy, theology, civil law, both Roman and Spanish, and canon law. A class of chemistry was established almost as soon as it became a distinct branch in Europe, and in 1820 a class of Constitutional law was also founded.

Young Felix Varela received the tonsure in 1806, and the degree of Bachelor of Theology in 1808, after having presented himself, with some others, as a candidate for the professorship, then called "of St. Thomas and Melchior Cano," and made a brilliant exhibition of his talent and learning in the competitive examination required by law.

In 1809 he received the four minor orders and the subdeaconship. He was ordained a deacon in 1811, and in the same year,

after another brilliant examination, he was appointed by the great Bishop of Havana, Señor Espada y Landa, to the chair of Philosophy in the Seminary.

In 1811 he was raised to the priesthood, and said his first mass in the church annexed to the convent of Carmelite nuns in Havana, where one of his aunts was a religious.

Father Varela, "the teacher," *el maestro*, as he was called in Cuba, soon became entitled to this appellation. There was no branch of human learning, cultivated at that time, with which he did not become familiar. Even in chemistry, then almost a new-born science, he went as far as any other had gone in the highest centres of civilization in Europe. God endowed him also with great musical talent, which he did not allow to be lost. He was a skilful performer on the violin, and took great pains in creating in Havana, in 1811, the *Philharmonical Society*, the earliest of its class ever established in Cuba.

The first philosophical work published by Father Varela was written in Latin, in the shape of detached sentences, or propositions, under the title *Propositiones variæ ad tironum exercitationem*. Each proposition was defended and argued in scholastic form. They were printed in 1812, to be used in his class and in the public examinations.

Soon after this, he published another set of propositions to be defended and discussed at the commencement of July 16, 1812. The title of this most curious pamphlet reads as follows:

"*Sub auspiciis Ill. D. D. Joannis Josephi Diaz de Espada et Landa, hujus diœcecis meritissimi præsulis, Regii conciliarii, etc., etc., has propositiones ex universa Philosophia depromptas tuebitur B. D. Nicolaus Emmanuel de Escobedo, in hoc S. Caroli Seminario Philosophiæ auditor. Discussio habebitur in generali gymnasio prædicti Seminarii, præside D. Felice Varela, Philosophiæ magistro, die 16 Julii, anni MDCCCXII. Typis Ant. Gil.*"

This pamphlet, consisting of twenty-five printed pages in octavo, contains two hundred and twenty-six propositions relating to all branches of science, metaphysics, logic, moral philosophy, physics, chemistry, astronomy, etc. It was reprinted, with additions and great improvements, in 1813.

In the same year (1812) Father Varela, at the request of the Archbishop of Santo Domingo, printed in Latin, in two volumes, to be used as text-books in the Ecclesiastical Seminary of that island, the work to which he gave the name of "*Institutiones Philosophiæ Ecclesiasticæ ad usum Studiosæ Juventutis. Habana, MDCCCXII.*" The first volume contains a treatise on logic, and the second a treatise on metaphysics.

In 1813, as it had been announced that Spanish would be al-

lowed in the classes instead of Latin, but "*not from any desire to introduce innovations*," Father Varela published the same book in Spanish, supplemented by a short treatise on mathematics, and another on general physics. He added a volume, also in Spanish, under the title of *Etica* (ethics).

No other work on philosophy had ever been printed in Spanish, either in Spain or any one of the dominions which she at that time possessed.

The catalogue of 1813, published under the title "*Examen Philosophicum de correctione mentis*," was his last Latin work.

In 1814 he published in Spanish a "*Recapitulation of the Doctrines, both Metaphysical and Moral, taught in the College of San Carlos at Havana*," and also a catalogue of propositions on natural philosophy, under the title, "*Doctrinas Fisicas*." These works embraced the whole course of mathematics, natural philosophy, chemistry, botany, zoölogy, physiology, and drawing, then generally taught.

Between 1812 and 1816 the popularity of Father Varela, both as a good priest and as an eminent scholar, in spite of his youth, had reached such a great height that no religious festival or public act of any importance was deemed complete unless Father Varela took some part in it.

Dr. Morales, of New York, Professor of Spanish language and literature in the College of that city, a cousin of the distinguished priest, has still in his possession, among other precious manuscripts, several sermons which Father Varela preached in Havana in 1812, 1813, and 1814, on public occasions. When the Constitution of 1812, proclaimed in Spain, was extended to Cuba, and the first election of representatives from Havana to the Spanish Cortes took place in that city on October 25th of the same year, the Mass of the Holy Ghost was said before the election, and Father Varela was invited to address the people. He complied with the request of his fellow-citizens, and, choosing for his text the words of the prophet, "*Veritatem tantum et pacem diligite*," exhorted his audience "not to listen to passion, and consider only the good of the country and the greater glory of God."

But no man, however gifted, can attain, when only twenty-six or twenty-eight years, that degree of maturity which gives a decided character and importance. The progressive spirit of Father Varela, stimulated and excited by the generous impulse and liberal views of Bishop Espada, could not rest within the narrow limits of the philosophy such as it was usually expounded at that time. Bishop Espada told him "to take the broom and sweep away from his lessons all that was not useful." Dr. Varela then began the work which secured for him the title of "Regenerator of Thought"

in the island of Cuba. His first production, after the remarkable injunction of the great prelate, was his *Elenco*, for the examinations of 1816. It was followed in 1818 by what he called "*Leccion Preliminar*," a pamphlet of eight pages; by the "*Apuntes Filosoficos sobre la direccion del intendimiento humano*," a little book of more importance, and by the "*Miscelánea Filosofica*," of which three editions appeared, Havana, 1817; Madrid, 1821; and New York, 1827.

His great work, "*Lecciones de Filosofia*," subsequently published, completed this series. It was in three volumes, and has been for many years the text-book in logic, metaphysics, ethics, natural philosophy, and chemistry in the colleges of Cuba, Mexico, and other countries of Spanish origin.

Without including the editions in Mexico and other parts, Father Varela himself personally superintended five editions. The first was at Havana in 1818, the second at Philadelphia in 1824, and three at New York in 1828, 1832, and 1841. Each edition was enlarged and improved considerably.

There existed in Cuba at this time a meritorious organization, founded in 1793, under the name of *Patriotic Society*, and was afterwards called "*Economical Society of Friends of the Country*." Its brilliant career is the pride of Cuba, being the record of whatever progress has been accomplished in the island. Its deliberations, conducted always in the right spirit, and inspired by pure patriotism, always exercising great influence, were then, perhaps, owing to the circumstances of the times, more useful than ever. It is scarcely necessary to say that Father Varela was a member of that Society.

He was admitted January 24th, 1817; and the speech he delivered in the ceremony of his reception was "on the influence of ideology on the life of society, and the means of popularizing sound notions in this branch of human learning."

He was assigned to the Committee on Education, which was then the most important one in the Society, and there he rendered services of great value. Besides his efforts for establishing schools, and propagating primary instruction, he wrote many reports, among others, on the Spanish grammars of Father Laguardia, and of D. Mariano Velasquez de la Cadena.

Father Varela wrote also, by direction of the Society, a "*Coleccion de Máximas Morales y Sociales*," to be used as a reader in the schools of Cuba. This little book, which is now quite a bibliographical curiosity, enjoyed great favor, and is exceedingly interesting.

In 1818 he was made an *emeritus* associate.

It is a curious fact that the Cuban people are always happier,

and enjoy liberty and self-government under *absolute* monarchy better than under any of the so-called liberal governments which have ruled Spain since 1837. Modern Spaniards seem to understand liberalism only in the destructive, never in the progressive, spirit. And so it has happened that the terms, *liberal* and *oppressor*, have become so much alike, in the eyes of the Spanish masses, as to cause them, when rising up in arms in revolutionary contests, to cry out, much to the astonishment of unthinking superficial observers, "*Down with liberty! Long live the chains! We want him* (*the king*) *to be despotical!*"

Liberal rule abolished every local privilege, and all vestiges of local self-government. It put an end to all exemptions of taxes, rights of asylum, freedom from conscription, and all special rights and favors granted by grateful sovereigns to different towns and cities. Even those *fueros*, or local laws, so dear to the people, were either modified or suppressed. Instead of the old traditional machinery to which the people was accustomed, which it loved, and of which in many respects it had good reasons to feel proud, the *regenerators* of Spain established a system of well-studied centralization, with a one-hundred-armed bureaucracy, and succeeded in making Spaniards all equal, if not in rights, at least in misfortunes. To crown their work with an achievement not easy to be forgotten, they closed the convents, abolished the religious orders, of course, and confiscated their property. Finally, they committed in Madrid and other cities the horrible massacres of priests and friars of 1837.

Ferdinand VII. was loved in Cuba. To his *despotic* rule she owed the liberty of commerce, and a great many local privileges and liberties, of which she was deprived by the *liberal* government of the *divine* Argüelles and Queen Cristina. Her towns and cities were represented at court by proctors, or attorneys (*procuradores*), who could reach his ear, and who often obtained, without difficulty, all the favors desired. The Patriotic Society, anxious to give expression to the grateful feelings of the country, resolved to celebrate a public session in recognition and acknowledgment of the Royal favors. An oration, equal to the occasion, and worthy of its importance, was required; and Father Varela was elected to deliver it. To this circumstance we owe his *Eulogio de Fernando VII.*, delivered the 12th of December, 1818, which not only met the expectations of the Society, but has been always considered as a model of eloquence, and one of the most instructive papers on Cuban history.

In the same year Father Varela pronounced his magnificent oration at the funeral of Señor Valiente, the Intendant of Havana. This sermon was delivered in the cathedral of that city, on the

10th of March, 1818. His text was, "*Consiliarius, vir prudens, et litteratus.*" (1 Paral., xxvii. 32.)

Another magnificent funeral oration was delivered May 12th, 1819, on the death of King Charles IV. It was no easy task to eulogize that sovereign; but Father Varela avoided the awkwardness of the situation by beginning his sermon with the words: "I do not praise the man, but I do pray for the King. Yes, brethren, I pray the King of kings, who was pleased to put the sceptre in the hands of Charles, to pour upon his soul the abundance of His mercies, to overlook his human frailties, and to guide my thoughts in such a way as to remind you, properly and correctly, of all the good he did during the twenty years he sat upon the throne, and the numerous benefits he bestowed upon his people."

The political revolution which took place in Spain in 1820, and brought again to life the Constitution of 1812, induced the Patriotic Society, with the permission and consent of Bishop Espada, to establish in the Seminary a class of Constitutional Law. Bishop Espada, under whose protection the new class had been placed, being anxious to give it a right direction, decided that this chair should be filled by Father Varela, and commanded him to prepare himself for his new position. We say *commanded*, because the disinclination of Father Varela to enter into this new field was so great, and so manifest, that the Bishop felt it necessary to interpose his authority, to which, of course, Father Varela submitted. The course was opened by him on the 18th of January, 1821, before an audience of ninety-three scholars and a numerous public, with a magnificent inaugural address, which has been preserved. A little later he published his "*Observaciones sobre la Constitucion de la monarquia Española*," printed in Havana in 1821.

Father Varela enjoyed to so high a degree the public confidence, that it will surprise none to hear that he was elected to represent Havana in the Spanish Cortes at the coming session of 1822.

When he left Cuba and took leave of the Patriotic Society by a letter dated April 9, 1821, he did not suspect that he would never again see that land of his birth, which he loved so deeply.

His legislative services were such as had been expected. It would be long and somewhat out of place to enumerate them in this article; but it seems just to state that the Patriotic Society resolved to tender him a vote of thanks "for his zeal and his patriotism and for his efforts to promote every measure tending to the improvement and prosperity of Cuba."

When the French intervention of 1823 proscribed and condemned to death the members of that Cortes, Father Varela escaped from Spain, and found a shelter in Gibraltar. Thence he sailed for the

United States, on the brig *Draper*, and arrived in New York on the 17th of December, 1823.

He was for a long time undecided whether to settle in New York or in Philadelphia. He lived for some time in the latter city, where he published a Spanish magazine under the name *El Habanero*, but he soon removed to New York.

Before abandoning public affairs, and devoting his energies to the ministry, Father Varela endeavored to master the English language. He translated into Spanish, and printed for the use of the schools in Cuba, *Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice*, the *Elements of Chemistry applied to Agriculture*, by Humphry Davy, and several articles in reviews and magazines.

He collected also during this period of enforced rest the poems of his fellow-countryman, Don Manuel Zequeira, which he published in New York in 1829. He was also a contributor to *El Mensagero Semanal*, a magazine which Señor Saco published in Philadelphia in 1829.

The piety and erudition of Father Varela were soon known in this country. Ere long Bishop Connolly, of New York, became acquainted with his theological acquirements and with his great zeal and virtue; and to the great satisfaction of the proscribed Cuban, that prelate adopted him as a priest of his diocese.

At that time the Catholic Church had no shrines in New York except old St. Peter's, St. Patrick's, and St. Mary's, usually attended by six priests, and never by more than nine, the Bishop included, scarcely sufficient to meet the necessities of a Catholic population of 35,000 souls. Philadelphia had four churches, St. Joseph's, St. Mary's, St. Augustine's, and Holy Trinity; but they were so poor and so scantily attended that from December, 1821, to December, 1822, there were only 26 marriages, 116 baptisms, and 242 funerals in St. Mary's; 26 marriages, 100 baptisms, and 35 funerals in St. Augustine's; and 4 marriages, 90 baptisms, and 35 funerals in the Holy Trinity.

St. Mary's Church, in New York, was a little frame building, and St. Peter's was so small that the doors were often left open, to permit people to kneel outside, as it was impossible for all to find place within to hear Mass, and listen to the instructions.

Bishop Du Bois, who succeeded Bishop Connolly October 29, 1826, appointed Father Varela assistant pastor of St. Peter's; where, as stated by Archbishop Bayley, "he entered upon that career of charity and self-devotion which has made his name one of benediction in the city of New York."[1]

In 1827, through the influence of Father Varela, and at his re-

[1] A Brief Sketch of the Early History of the Catholic Church in the island of New York, by Rev. J. R. Bayley. New York, 1870.

quest, three Cuban gentlemen (Señors Lasala, Alfonso, and Garcia), advanced nineteen thousand dollars with which Christ Church, in Ann street, was purchased from the Episcopalians by Father Varela, and became the fourth Catholic church in the great metropolis. Bishop Du Bois appointed him pastor of this new parish.

Father Varela established schools for boys and girls, and became within the limits of his parish, and often also outside these limits, a true apostle of charity. This charity for the poor became a matter of praise and even of astonishment; and numberless anecdotes attesting its extent and character might be related which would almost be taken for pious legends. The poor and the sick were the principal objects of his affection and care. He went to them at all times, he gave them all that he possessed,—even the coat he had on, as he did on one occasion in winter, to a poor man who had been stripped in the street; and when the cholera was raging in New York in 1832, Father Varela may be said to have lived in the hospitals.

He established several sodalities and charitable associations in his church; organized a Sunday-school, in which he himself was the principal teacher, and established a library. It was then that he wrote a *Catechism of Christian Doctrine*, mentioned by Father Finotti in his *Bibliographia Catholica Americana*, several Catholic "Tracts" on Biblical subjects to counteract the "Tracts" of the Protestants, and his most interesting work, *The Protestant's Abridger and Expositor*, published by subscription, the purpose of which was to refute the weekly paper named *The Protestant*, which was then calling the Catholics "uncircumcised Philistines," representing their priests as impostors, and attacking every Catholic doctrine and institution.

In 1834, as Christ Church was pronounced no longer safe, Father Varela continued divine worship in a private house of the neighborhood temporarily fitted up for that purpose. In the following year a new church was begun, but on a different site, in James street, and Father Varela continued at its head until 1836.

The life of a Catholic priest in the United States was not at that time what it is to-day, and much less by far what it is in Cuba or other Catholic countries. That was a serious time of anti-Catholic agitation, of official prejudices, as well as of actual persecution. His *Cartas à Elpidio* show the many vexations, and sometimes insults, to which Father Varela was subjected in his visits to hospitals and asylums. That was the period of the destruction by incendiaries of the Ursuline Convent, Charlestown, of the anti-Catholic riots in Boston (when Father Varela happened to be present), and of the attempt to fire the Catholic Cathedral of New York. That was the period when such books as *Louise, or The Canadian Nun;*

Rebecca Reid's Six Months in a Convent; The Awful Disclosures by Maria Monk, and others, were making infamous charges and heaping calumnies and odium upon the heads of the Catholics. But Father Varela proved to be equal to the occasion. He was a man of great decision of character and of indomitable courage in the defence of truth. Archbishop Bayley says that "this slow but sure progress of the Church was not made without much opposition. The Rev. Dr. Varela, the Rev. Dr. Power, and the Rev. Mr. Schneller did good service;" and he praises particularly the articles that Father Varela published in answer to the attacks of the Protestants, and more especially of the celebrated Dr. Brownlee, of the Dutch Reformed Church.

It is stated that Father Varela was soon acknowledged to be a profound theologian, and the essay he published under the title: *The Five Different Bibles Distributed and Sold by the American Bible Society*, while one of the best papers ever written on the subject, unmasked that society and secured a great triumph for the cause of truth.

In an oral discussion with Dr. Brownlee, the latter, having nothing to say in reply to the formidable arguments of the learned priest, resorted to the expedient of announcing that the doctrines of Father Varela were not Catholic doctrines, and that *his Bishop* would at once disapprove and condemn them.

Father Varela took part in another controversy with the same Dr. Brownlee. One record of this discussion was printed in Philadelphia in 1833 under the title of *The Religious Controversy between the Rev. Dr. W. C. Brownlee on the part of the Protestants, and the Rev. Drs. John Power, Thomas C. Levins and Felix Varela on the part of the Roman Catholics.*

When the year 1836 came a new field was open to the activity and zeal of Father Varela. His record during the thirteen years he had spent in this country could scarcely be surpassed, yet it pales in comparison with his later labors.

The Catholic population of New York had enormously increased, but the pecuniary resources of the Church had not followed the same proportion. A new church was indispensable, but there were no means to build it. A financial crisis, one of those panics which from time to time make their appearance in the financial world, and bring utter prostration of business, had just been experienced, and rendered the work more burdensome. The new church, however, was the constant preoccupation of Father Varela, and God secured its erection.

Mr. John Delmonico, of New York, founder of the family of that name in the great metropolis, was one of the fervent admirers of Father Varela. One day when going through Chambers street,

on his way home, he happened to pass in front of a Presbyterian church, that was actually under the auctioneer's hammer. He took his stand among the bidders and succeeded in purchasing the building for $56,000. A portion of this price was paid down by him, and the rest was secured by mortgage on the property. Signor Delmonico had the deed executed to Felix O'Neil and others as trustees, but the instrument declares that the money had been supplied by Father Varela.

The new church property repaired and arranged was dedicated on the 31st of March, 1836, under the name of *Church of the Transfiguration*. The people always called it "Father Varela's church."

Father Varela was appointed to be its pastor, and for a time had as assistant the learned Italian priest, Father Mupietti.

The difficulties with which Father Varela had to struggle on account of the heavy debt of his church scarcely admit description. A learned economist might perhaps have condemned the whole undertaking as unbusiness-like and "injudicious;" but Father Varela trusted in something else than the precepts of political economy, and often said: "Never mind, go on, the sun shines for all without distinction."

The church does not exist to-day where it was. It was demolished after the death of Father Varela and transferred to Mott street, where it now stands. The memory of its first pastor is still preserved among the people of the parish with the greatest love and veneration.

One characteristic feature of the religious spirit of Father Varela was his constant effort to associate Catholic faith with happiness, cheerfulness, hopeful views, consolation, and encouragement.

"Bear always in mind," he said, "that prayers are made to bring us consolation, not torture." "True religion brings happiness, and history teaches that most of human miseries have resulted from the attempt to substitute for its everlasting principles others both doubtful and inconstant."

It would be long to enter into any detailed account of all that Father Varela did between 1836, when he became the pastor of Transfiguration Church, and 1853, when he died. It suffices to say that nothing represents better the typical life of a good pastor than the life of Father Varela during this period of time. It was then when he displayed that extraordinary charity, zeal, and unbounded absolute self-denial which made him so conspicuous and universally loved and respected—when everything he had, his money, his watch, his spoons, his clothing, even the coverlets of his bed, which he on one occasion gave away through the window to avoid the scolding of the housekeeper, passed to the hands of the poor. It was then, also, that he founded what was

called the *Half-Orphan Asylum*, which he started with eight hundred dollars given him by a lady of his parish.

He wrote during this period many works, some of which have been published, while others still remain in manuscript or have been lost. One of his papers on the "distribution of time, maxims for human intercourse, and religious practices," written in Spanish for one of his penitents, has been inserted in his *Life*. He wrote, also in Spanish, a very interesting book, under the title of *Advertencia á los católicos, etc.*, specially intended to prevent Spaniards coming to the United States from becoming Protestants, and to warn them against heretical and infidel doctrines. This book was never printed.

He also wrote in Spanish *Entretenimientos religiosos en la noche buena* (never printed), and published two volumes of his remarkable work *Cartas á Elpidió*, bearing, the first on *Infidelity* and the second on *Superstition*. Both volumes were printed in Spanish in New York, the first in 1835 and the second in 1838. The first volume was reprinted in Madrid, where it was received with great favor. A third volume, on *Fanaticism*, has never been printed.

His dearly loved Cuba was never forgotten by Father Varela, who, in the midst of his numerous and overwhelming labors, always found the means to do something conducive to her benefit. He contributed to the *Revista Bimestre Cubana*, the best review ever published in the Spanish language, according to the authority of Quintana; he corresponded with the most distinguished and prominent men of Cuba at that period; he exhorted them to keep always in the right path; and when a philosophical discussion on Eclecticism and the then popular doctrines of Victor Cousin was carried to such an extreme in Cuba as to become one of the events of the period, Father Varela wrote his celebrated letter of October 22, 1840, which was read by all with admiration, and is still considered as a magnificent exhibition of sound doctrines blended with charity and patriotism.

In 1841 Father Varela undertook, in union with Doctor Charles Constantine Pise, the publication of a monthly magazine known as *The Catholic Expositor*. Its first number was issued in the month of April, 1841, and it continued for several years.

In the third Provincial Council, held at Baltimore, in April, 1837, Father Varela attended as *procurator* for New York.

In the same year he was appointed Vicar General of that diocese; and when a coadjutor was proposed to Bishop Du Bois, in 1837, the name of Father Varela was mentioned for that position. He never worked as hard as he did on this occasion to prevent his appointment.

In 1841 the Faculty of Theology of St. Mary's College, of Bal-

timore, conferred upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Theology; and in 1846 he attended another Provincial Council which met at Baltimore, and whose inaugural session was held on the 10th of May. He went as theologian to Bishop Hughes.

A life of constant work and self-denial, attending sick-calls at all hours, day and night, in every description of weather, always on foot, and never well protected—continued assiduity, and voluntary deprivation of all comfort, and even of the most necessary things —that *watching when all sleep*, as he said in one of his letters to a friend in Havana—with incessant mental activity, could terminate in but one result. Father Varela's health was undermined and ruined; and in 1846 he found himself prostrated, and unable to do the slightest work. He used to say, with a pleasant cheerful smile, half in jest and half in earnest, that he had three or four diseases at the same time, all struggling to break him down.

At this time some friends in New York carried him to Florida, to the city of St. Augustine. The genial climate of the land of Ponce de Leon, its sea-breezes, its tropical atmosphere, benefited the great priest. He was forced to remain there by the injunctions of his prelate and the requests of his friends; but in July, 1849, he thought he had recovered sufficiently to come back to his parish. He was mistaken, however; as soon as the winter set in he was disabled. He could neither lie down, nor assume a recumbent position. It seems that his lungs were gone.

His friends hurried him back again to St. Augustine; and there, after two more long years of suffering, he died in the month of February, 1853.

When the sad news of his death reached New York, a feeling of consternation prevailed among the Catholics. It seemed as if they had lost their best friend and protector.

The *Freeman's Journal* of March 12, 1853, published an account of his death, with the letter of Father Stephen Sheridan announcing it, and explaining its circumstances.

The feeling in Florida, among whose people he had lived for about seven years, was so full of love and admiration as to render impossible the transportation of Father Varela's remains, either to Cuba or to New York. The opposition of the people was so great, when either project was discussed, that a riot was feared, and they had to be abandoned.

Father Finotti says in a letter, written by him to the author of this article in 1875: "Nowhere will his labors be more appreciated than in the United States. His name is now a household word with our clergy." We shall say in our turn that his name is also a household word with every one who feels love and admiration for real greatness, superior intellect, and Christian virtues.

CAPITAL AND LABOR.

Del Comunismo, Esame Critico Filosofico e Politico. P. Valentino Steccanella. Roma, 1882.

Communism in America; the Yale John A. Porter Prize Essay for 1878. Henry Ammon James, B.A., of the Law Department of Yale College. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1879.

Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration. Carroll D. Wright. Boston: Rand, Avery & Co., No. 117 Franklin Street, 1881.

COMMUNISTS and Socialists are at one in their views of private capital. They consider it the most fruitful source of the poverty and crime that have afflicted the world, and the chief obstacle in the way of that millennium to which they would lead modern society. Capitalists, they tell us, are a class who reap where they have not sown, who live in idleness and luxury, corrupt themselves, and corrupting all around them. They are parasites, that draw life and sustenance from society, without giving it anything in return. They are usurers, extortioners, and robbers, who, in a thousand ways, despoil the laborer of the fruit of his toil, and condemn him to lifelong want and suffering. This is the burden of the charges brought against capital by socialistic writers and orators, and which they emphasize with that cheap explosive rhetoric with which we are all familiar, and which seldom fails to dazzle and excite the selfish and unthinking, who are brought under its influence.

The socialist, then, would "suppress" the capitalist, and would do so by withdrawing the "means of labor," that is, factories, workshops, raw material, machinery, and the capital necessary to employ them, from the control of private individuals, and make them the property of the state, or the commune. He would, indeed, give the individual private property in his direct earnings, that is, he would permit him to exchange what he had produced from the soil for other equivalent products (Steccanella, page 107), or pay him in certificates that would be exchangeable for commodities, depriving him, however, of all opportunities of personal enrichment (James, *Communism in America*, page 53). This shadowy individual ownership can hardly be said to modify, in any appreciable degree, the communistic principle that underlies every socialistic theory.

But, does the capitalist merit the opprobrious epithets heaped upon him by socialistic writers and orators? Is he, really, the *hostis humani generis* they represent him? He may, indeed, be a

drone, he may gather where he has not sown, he may be a sensualist, he may be an extortioner, a usurer who will take his pound of flesh when he can get it, but is he necessarily such? Is he such, because he is a capitalist? It were simply absurd to say so. Wealth, it is true, is a very dangerous acquisition. "For many have been brought to fall for gold, and the beauty thereof has been their ruin." It is, nevertheless, no crime to be rich. "Solomon exceeded all the kings of the earth in riches," yet, "he loved the Lord, walking in the precepts of David his father." It is forbidden to amass wealth unjustly, to love it inordinately, to spend it wastefully or for evil purposes. But to acquire and enjoy it without injury to others or one's self, is no sin. If it be, where does the sin begin? At fifty, or a hundred thousand? At a million, or at ten millions? Your socialistic moralist would, I fear, find it no easy matter to name the guilty figure. Good and bad are to be found in every class of society, among the poor as well as among the rich, among workmen as well as among employers and capitalists. But can the capitalist, even when he receives what is generally considered only a fair and just return on his investments, be said to do an injury to society, and, especially, to the workingman? Certainly not.

Every service we render others calls for a proportionate compensation. This is a truth which no one can gainsay. The capitalist rents his lands to farmers, who are thus provided with homes for themselves and their families, and who, if thrifty and economical, can not only pay their rent, but, in the course of a few years, put aside enough money to buy farms for themselves. He rents his houses to tenants, who are unable or unwilling to buy houses of their own. Does he not render to both these classes a real and very substantial service for which they owe him an equivalent return? He invests his money in bonds or in stocks, and, by so doing, helps the government to pay its debts, and private corporations to commence and carry on business. Does this aid which they solicit and receive from him give him no claim to his interest and his dividends? He lends it to individual merchants or manufacturers, who, by business talent, tact, and thrift, realize on it twenty per cent., and give him half this amount. Must he be deemed a robber because he accepts this interest? If so, he must be a strange sort of robber, indeed. He is a robber whom very many persons like to meet, and are generally the better for having met. He is a robber whom thousands go in search of every day in our cities and towns. He is a robber who helps men to fortune instead of depriving them of it, and who, by developing the industries of the community, and the resources of the country in which he lives, establishes a claim to the gratitude and respect of

both rich and poor. There are, it seems to me, very few cities in this or any other country where distinguished robbers of this class would not be welcome to spend their booty in adding to the number of their mills and factories.

Then, the capitalist, instead of lending his money, might himself use it in business, and thus gain not ten but twenty per cent. on his investment. He might spend it in works of charity or philanthropy, or to gratify his tastes, or his pleasures. But by lending it he puts it out of his power, for a specified time, to make any use whatever of it. He thus subjects himself to a very serious inconvenience for the benefit of others, for which in the nature of things they are bound to compensate him.

Again, loans generally involve risks, and when they do, compensation, in proportion to the risk run, can, in justice, be asked and received.

Nor need any apprehension be felt for the so much talked of concentration of capital, in our day, in the hands of a few. I may be mistaken, but I have the impression, received from a desultory reading of general history, that capital was never as generally distributed as now. To the slaves and serfs and dependents of former days, has succeeded a numerous and well-to-do middle class of comparatively recent growth. Manufacture is more centralized now than in the past, owing to the introduction of machinery; but this cannot be said of agriculture or trade, at least in this country. In these two departments of industry, the gradations between poverty and wealth are more numerous than at any previous time. Dire distress is still to be met with in some places, but when was the world without it? With a population of more than fifty millions, we have in this country, perhaps, a dozen men of colossal fortunes—merchant princes, railroad and mining kings, who certainly have great power for evil as well as for good. But there is no reason to fear them. Their treasures are not locked up in vaults, but invested in wealth-producing industries that benefit the masses as well as their possessors. Here property is not entailed. In a little while, these autocrats of the Stock Exchange will pass away and their fortunes will be divided amongst their heirs, who, in the majority of cases, will spend them in less time than it has taken to accumulate them.

Great corporations, such as railroads, telegraph and express companies, representing, as they do millions, and sometimes hundreds of millions of capital, may, it is true, use the power this capital gives them to the injury of particular classes, of private individuals or of smaller corporations. But this, it seems to me, must be the exception, not the rule. Those who are thus injured are very few indeed, compared with the vast multitudes benefited by these bodies.

It is clearly the interest as well as the duty of these companies to deal fairly with the public. Their charters, their rules, their rates, are in the hands of all. If there be aught in their organization or their management that infringes the rights of individuals or of the community, the remedy is with the representatives of the people or with the courts. They owe their existence to law. It governs them. They are as amenable to existing laws as any individual in the land. Our legislatures and our courts should be able to keep them to their observance. If they do not, then elect representatives and judges that will. If this be thought impossible, why advocate legislation that would put the vast interests involved in these corporations at the mercy of bodies you declare to be irreclaimably corrupt? Would it not be wiser to leave them, as far as possible, under the control of those who own them, the bond and stock holders, and of their officers who best understand their management, than to put them in the hands of men who will be sure to use them for partisan purposes and personal profit, and thus make their securities valueless and bring ruin on the thousands whose means are invested in them? Is it not notorious that the worst managed business in this or perhaps any other country, is that over which our municipal, state and federal governments have control? If we cannot have honest and competent legislators, the fewer laws are made the better. If we can, their first care should be to interfere as little as possible with the freedom of individuals or of corporations, limiting their enactments to such statutes as are necessary to carry out and enforce the fundamental law.

The corporations under consideration are not state or philanthropic organizations. They are business concerns. They may be common or public carriers, and as such control highways. They may supply other public wants of the community. But whilst such functions bring them more immediately under government supervision than other organizations less directly connected with the public welfare, it does not make them cease to be, in other respects, private corporations. They were formed, they are owned and managed, by private individuals. They are bound to fulfil any specific obligations they may have contracted towards the public, but beyond holding them to this, the government has no control over them and should not interfere with them, unless where their stocks are owned and the companies are controlled by the state. And even where they received land-grants or other subsidies from the government, these, it must be presumed, in the absence of express stipulations to the contrary, were not intended to secure for the government, control in their management, but simply to encourage their formation as a means of settling its wild lands and increasing its revenue. These advantages are more than sufficient to compensate

the government for any favors of this kind bestowed upon them. Bouvier (*Law Dictionary*, page 409) says in this connection: "It makes no difference in regard to the rights of the corporation that it may have received large grants of land or other property from the state or sovereignty conferring the charter. Unless the stock is owned by the state, or the appointment and control of the principal officers are retained by the state, so as to create it a public corporation, its essential franchises are inviolable to the same extent as other private rights of a pecuniary character, and its functions are equally independent of legislative control, as are those of any natural person."

Corporations are managed by men, and their managers, like the rest of men, will sometimes exhibit the ordinary frailties of human nature. They will, now and then, be indiscreet, overbearing, vindictive, selfish. In violations of the rules of their companies, they will occasionally engage in branches of business along their lines, and give advantages to those with whom they are thus connected, which they deny to others. Different roads will pool their earnings, to the exclusion and prevention of such healthy competition as would be of advantage to the public. In their desire to extend their operations, they will contract debts they are unable to carry, and which depreciate the value of their securities already issued. This, of course, is all wrong, but it does not justify legislation that would embarrass the action of the companies themselves, prevent their development, or curtail their legitimate profits.

Who does not know that, in our day, railroads are everywhere, and especially in this country, one of the chief factors of material prosperity. They give employment to hundreds of thousands, and to men of almost every class and profession. They stimulate invention in many of the useful arts. They minimize the cost and the hardships of travel. They develop the natural resources of the country as no other agencies could do. They meet the immigrant as he touches these shores, and carry him swiftly and cheaply to the soil that has waited for his plough from the beginning of the world, and give him a home on terms that make it almost a gratuity. They transport our minerals from the lakes and from the territories to our manufacturing centres, and our beef and breadstuffs from the Rocky Mountains and the Plains to the Gulf of Mexico. Without them, the West would be to-day a hundred years behind the point it has reached in material development.

But they do more than this. They are great conservative forces in our society. In every state they have vast interests at stake. In every legislature they have, as they should have, an influence in proportion to the numbers and the capital they represent. They are thus enabled, and in self-defence they are often obliged, to

keep legislation within proper limits, and defeat the schemes of unscrupulous lobbyists and wirepullers to fleece the public. Whilst protecting themselves, they protect others.

They are, also, a bond of union between the different states and sections of this confederacy. The more extended their operations, the greater their influence, the stronger that bond becomes. It is the interest of the roads, it is the interest of all those who hold their securities, to do what they can to avert civil strife, and discountenance whatever would even remotely threaten the integrity of the Union. Slavery had much less to do in bringing about the late civil war than the sectional interests of the South, and its desire to build up a great southern empire. The rapid changes in the avenues of trade and commerce, taking place in our day, may put a like temptation in the way of other parts of this country sooner than we think for. Professional patriots and politicians are not to be relied on in such a crisis. Men who systematically rob their country, will, it is to be feared, not hesitate to divide it when it becomes worth their while to do so. So, in such a contingency, our chief hope would be in our great corporations, and, especially, in our railroads. Had Northern roads and Northern capital had, relatively, as much influence in the South before the war as they have now, or are destined to have in the near future, the rebellion might not have occurred. But, be this as it may, it is certain that great railroad companies, extending their lines, as ours are soon destined to do, from ocean to ocean, and from Canada to the Gulf, are, in themselves, the best guarantee we can have of national unity in the future. They will prevent secession, which, were it to occur, could be remedied only at the cost of much blood and treasure.

Whilst providing, then, as far as possible, against abuses, on the part of corporations, they should be dealt with in a friendly, not a hostile spirit. Laws intended to affect them should be framed with the greatest care, and by lawyers of acknowledged ability and integrity. "Tidal-wave legislation," in their affairs, might be productive of very serious consequences before it could be repealed. In trying to remove the evils of "monopolies," we should not have recourse to remedies that would be worse than the disease. The danger to be apprehended, just now, is, it seems to us, not the growing strength of private corporations, but the undue interference of the state in their affairs. The effects of this interference on municipal affairs, where it is less reprehensible than in the case of private corporations, and the motives that inspire it, may be gathered from the following paragraph from the Philadelphia *Ledger* of a recent date:

"State commissions appointed to do municipal work, are always at variance with sound principles of local government or home

rule; but the Delaware legislature, by appointing a water commissioner to take charge of the water supply of Wilmington, hitherto under the control of the city government, has made this abuse of power so clear, that it may serve for future illustration of more obscure cases. The sole motive of the change appears to have been partisan; there is no allegation of local mismanagement, but the majority of the city council differs in political faith from the majority of the legislature, and by creating the commission, power and patronage are transferred from one party to the other. Even the partisan advocates of a commission ought to be able to see, however, that it is unjust to take from the people of Wilmington the control of the water works, which they alone use and pay for, and to give that control to the agents of members of the State legislature from all parts of Delaware. Philadelphia has suffered grave injuries from just such abuses of legislative power. Not even in Ireland is there more reason for the existence of a party of 'Home Rulers' than there is, in many instances, in American cities."

But it is not alone the capitalist, technically so called, that is anathematized by the apostles of Socialism; the manufacturer, and all who profit by the labor of others, fare no better at their hands. According to Lassalle, Marx, and Proudhon, all that remains to the manufacturer, after having paid the cost of production, or, in other words, his net profit, belongs not to him but to his workmen. The reason of this is, they say, and as the Socialist Society of German Workmen stated in their address, in 1875, that "labor is the source of all wealth, and of all culture," and that, as the difference of value between the raw material and the manufactured article has been caused by labor, to the laborer it belongs, after the necessary expenses of production have been deducted from it.

This is truly a startling claim, but, happily, it is as absurd as it is startling. Labor is, indeed, a source of wealth and culture, but it is not the only one. There are many others, needless to mention here. In the cases under consideration there are, ordinarily, three sources or efficient causes of the profit realized,—capital, directing skill, and labor. With us the manufacturer generally represents the first two. He provides the means necessary to build the mill or factory, to furnish it with the necessary machinery, to purchase the raw material, and pay the hands. The workman converts the raw material into the manufactured article that is to be put upon the market. These three causes are indispensable factors of this sort of production, but all are not equally important. Common labor is easily procured, and what is common and easy to procure is, in the nature of things, cheap. Skilled labor, because more rare, commands a higher price. But rarer than skilled labor is

the intelligence that enables a man to provide the money and material necessary to run a mill, or a large workshop, to superintend its various departments, and find a market for its products. Such a man does not work with his hands, but his brain works, how ceaselessly you may tell by his haggard looks, and the anxious days and the sleepless nights he is doomed to pass. He is the guiding spirit of the establishment over which he presides. It is he who gives unity and direction to its different departments. The workmen are intelligent instruments in his hands, by which he forms the fabrics on which they are engaged. Surely, then, he has a right to an important share in the profits of the work to which he contributes so much.

Capital is harder to command than either labor or superintendence. It is, in itself, fruitful of good to its possessor. It gives him a right to the domestic and social enjoyment it procures for him. Should it cease to benefit him when, instead of spending it on himself, he invests it in business? Capital is not treasure-trove. It is presumed to be, and usually is, accumulated savings. It represents the labor, the privations, the thrift of years on the part of the manufacturer. Why should the fruit of so much toil, of so many privations be enjoyed by others without paying for it? The thing is preposterous. The manufacturer, then, representing two of the three causes of production above mentioned, that is, the money and the brains of the establishment, has a right not only to a share in the profits, but to a share proportionate to the influence he had in realizing them. The effect belongs to the cause or causes that produced it. What remains belongs, for the same reason, to the workmen.

This being the principle that underlies the matter, to know precisely how much of the profit should go to the manufacturer we have only to determine what should be considered a just compensation to the laborer. Can this be done? It can; though at times not without considerable difficulty. One reason of the difficulty is, that the value of labor is not absolute, but to a great extent relative. It is affected by a variety of circumstances; by the kind and quality of the labor, by the amount performed within a given time, by the law of supply and demand, by the cost of living. Brumidi, who frescoed the dome of the Capitol at Washington, had a right to better pay than the man who swept the floor beneath him. The mechanic who does twice the amount of work of a given kind done by another, and does it as well, is entitled to twice as much wages. When laborers are few higher wages are offered, and may be accepted, than when they are plenty. In our day, a bill-poster is better paid than was Domenichino in the sixteenth century, when at work on his greatest masterpieces. But, if labor

was cheap then, so also were the necessaries of life. Labor, according to Ricardo, and other political economists, has its natural and its current prices. The natural price is that amount of compensation that enables the workman to support himself and his family. The current price is the wages he actually receives, and which is regulated by the law of supply and demand. The workman must live and make suitable provision for his wife and children. He can do this only by his labor. His labor, then, is worth to him what will give him and his the means of support. He can ask this amount of compensation for it, but no one is bound to give it to him, except in virtue of a contract made with him. Wages suppose a free contract between laborer and employer, a contract of bargain and sale. It is the contract that gives the laborer a claim to his wages. Antecedently to this contract he has no claim to receive the amount of them from the employer or anybody else. No employer is bound to engage his services. Society does not owe him a living, except in the sense that it cannot prevent his obtaining it by honest means. He can ask the natural price for his labor, he can refuse to take less, but he cannot compel others to give it to him. His labor is worth it to him, but it may not be worth it to the employer. Generally speaking, it is; but, under certain circumstances, it may not be. There are some laborers, at every trade, who "are not worth their salt." The employer is not bound to pay the natural price for labor when the price of the article to be manufactured will not enable him to do so. When it does, he should pay that price, for justice requires that a man should give an equivalent for what he receives. In this matter, however, the employer should consider not only the actual, but also the prospective value of the article. Some articles fall in price to rise no more. Others are subject only to periodical fluctuations in value. When the employer foresees that he can carry these through a period of depression, and sell them at a large profit, the labor that produces them is worth more than the current price, and he is bound to pay more. Immense profits are made by individuals and by corporations with large capital, who can afford to manufacture extensively when prices and labor are low, and wait to sell till prices are high. This can hardly be done without injustice to the workman.

What is certain, then, in this matter, is this, that when labor is worth its natural price, the employer is bound to pay it. When it is worth more, he should pay more. In like manner the workman cannot exact more for his labor than it is worth to the employer. Each is bound to give a just equivalent for what he receives. But who shall decide what that equivalent should be? It is certainly within the competency of government to legislate on

the labor question. In every country this question greatly affects the public welfare, and, occasionally, even the peace of society. It is, therefore, a proper subject for legislation. And, in point of fact, governments have in all times legislated on it. There is, however, one difficulty connected with it with which they have been loath to grapple, and which they have for the most part approached only indirectly, and it is this: how to regulate future rates of wages, so as to make them at once equitable and satisfactory to laborer and employer, and be able to enforce their observance. In the Middle Ages the maximum price was sometimes fixed by law, and it was made punishable for the employer to give or for the laborer to receive more. In our own day boards of arbitration and conciliation have undertaken to deal with this and other difficulties growing out of the labor question, and they have done so with very considerable success. Of these boards Joseph D. Weeks, Special Commissioner of the State of Pennsylvania, says in his report to the Bureau of Statistics of Massachusetts in 1881:

"Boards or courts of arbitration and conciliation, for the settlement of certain or all disputes or differences between employers and employed, have existed generally in the industries of France and Belgium since early in the century, and in England, for certain trades, for twenty years. The constitution and method of these boards, and the success that has attended them, can be learned in detail from the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor for 1877, or from a report of an investigation, with their practical workings, made to the Governor of Pennsylvania in 1879, by the writer. It is sufficient here to remark that, in France, in 1878, there were brought before these boards, the *Conseils des Prud'hommes*, which are established at unimportant trade centres, and which are quasi-judicial bodies, with legal sanctions for their awards, 35,046 cases, of which 25,834 were heard in private without a formal trial, and 71 per cent. settled without a public hearing. Of the entire number of cases 21,368 were relative to wages, 4733 to dismissals, and 1795 to matters relative to apprentices.

"In England where these boards are purely voluntary, without any legal existence or sanction to their decisions, their success in removing causes of difference between employer and employed, or in settling disputes, should they arise, has been most marked in those trades in which the principle has been fairly tried. In the hosiery trade of Nottingham, in which a board has been in existence for twenty years, there has been no general strike since its organization. In the manufactured iron trade of the north of England, where the board has a history for ten years, it is also true that in that time there has been no general strike; though in both of these trades, prior to the establishment of these boards,

strikes and other labor troubles were exceedingly frequent, and though, further, the nature of these trades is such as to render the settlement of questions of wages extremely difficult.

"In this country formal arbitration and conciliation in the sense that these words are understood in, in England, has a very meagre history. The cases are very few in which boards have been organized on a basis similar to the English boards, and formal arbitration attempted; and in only a single instance have these boards outlived the first attempt to settle a dispute or difference.

"Industrial arbitration is both the name of a principle and the specific application of that principle. As a principle, arbitration is a method of settling disputes or differences between employers and employed, by a reference of the matters at issue to a board composed of representatives of each of the two parties to the question, the representatives of each being elected or appointed by the parties themselves, the board to have power to hear testimony and decide the question, or, in the event of a failure of the board to decide, with power to call in one or more parties, whose decision in the case shall be final, and binding on both parties represented in the board." . . . .

"I am thus careful in defining arbitration, as the term has been applied to a practice in this country, which, however commendable it may be in itself, is not arbitration. This is the custom that exists in some of the labor organizations, of choosing a committee, composed entirely of the members of the organization, that is termed an arbitration committee, before which all or certain disputes between employers and employed are brought. . . . . Whatever such a principle may be called, it certainly is not arbitration. It is no doubt a very commendable proceeding to endeavor to investigate fairly both sides of a dispute, rather than rush headlong into a strike; and there is no doubt but that in such cases the board, or committee honestly endeavor to arrive at a just conclusion; but notwithstanding this, the act and decision are not those of a board of arbitration. In a word, it is as impossible for one party to a dispute to arbitrate, as it is for one man to fight a duel." . . . .

"Conciliation is not formal; it does not sit in judgment. It does not necessarily imply a board or a court, although the best results follow when the conciliation is systematic, under the influence, direction and authority of a board. . . . . While there has been little or no conciliation in this country, such as exists in the trades of England, that is, systematic through the medium of permanent committees organized for the purpose, there are certain forms of conciliation that have a history, that if it could be told would be the brightest and the most hopeful chapter in the indus-

trial history of our country. . . . . They are worked out in the quiet of the counting-house and office, where employer and employed meet as equals, and as man should meet man, and then and there, in all kindliness and good feeling, settle their differences before they become disputes. . . . . There is, however, a form of conciliation that has been practiced in centres where certain industries have gathered, of which we *have* the history. A committee representing the organized labor in these industries has met a similar committee representing the manufacturers in the same industry, and between them they have agreed upon future rates of wages, and settled their differences. This is notably the case in the iron industries at Pittsburg." (*Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration*, page 106.)

In this report, compiled by Carrol D. Wright, Chief of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics, will be found a detailed account of the organization of arbitration boards, and of the results obtained by them in different places.

They have not accomplished all the good that was to be desired, but, in our opinion, they have done all that could have been reasonably expected of them. Neither they, nor any organization that could be framed, would be able to furnish a solution of the wage-question that would be acceptable in all cases to the parties interested. And the reason is, that in a free country neither boards nor government can compel men to work for wages they deem insufficient, or oblige employers to pay wages they consider too high. There is nothing of which men are as absolute masters as of their labor and their capital. You can no more settle this question absolutely and definitely than you can any other question of bargain and sale, or for the matter of that, any other moral question connected with the Decalogue. Nevertheless, boards of arbitration can do much in this direction, and when an evil cannot be wholly removed, its diminution may at least make it cease to be formidable. These boards are, presumably, composed of experts in the matters brought under their cognizance. Representing, as they do, both employers and employed, they have at heart the interests of both. They know the requirements of trade, the price of the raw material, the cost of manufacture, the state of the markets, and the profits that should accrue to the manufacturer. They are acquainted with the character, habits and condition of the workman, and can best tell, at any given time, how much he needs to maintain his family in a manner suitable to their condition, to educate his children and lay up something " for the wet day and the sore foot," for times of enforced idleness, for sickness, and for old age And knowing all this, they are best able to decide what the em-

ployer can afford to give, and what the workman should be contented to receive for his labor.

Further than this they cannot go. "They can lead the horse to the stream, but they cannot make him drink." If the employer is unwilling to pay the amount of wages fixed by the arbitrators, he can put out his fires, and shut up his factory. If the laborer will not accept it he can quit work and go on a strike.

And thus, it is evident that behind this question of wages there is a moral question, or rather there are moral questions on which it ultimately depends for settlement. If workmen are not sober, industrious, and economical; if they indulge tastes that are extravagant in persons of their condition; if they are too eager to rise above their condition in life, no amount of wages will satisfy them, and the more they get the more they will try to exact. If, on the other hand, employers are bent on making rapid fortunes, or live beyond their means, they will seldom give the laborer any more than they can help, and not unfrequently try to cut down his wages to the starvation-point.

Both workman and employer must be persuaded that there is another life better than the present, and a happiness this world cannot give. They must believe and feel that there is trouble and danger as well as joy in wealth, that "a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven," and that "they who hasten to become rich, fall into temptation and into the snare of the devil, and into many unprofitable and hurtful desires, which drown men in destruction and perdition." It is only such considerations that can restrain men's cupidity, and make them deal justly and charitably with each other. Money ministers to all the passions, to pride, ambition, avarice, sensuality and luxury, and it is only the strongest religious convictions, and confirmed habits of virtue, that can keep men from seeking it inordinately, and acquiring it by dishonest means. *Pecuniæ obediunt omnia.* Destroy or unsettle their belief in a hereafter, in a future state of rewards and punishments, and justice and every other virtue will lose for them its motive and its meaning. They will recognize no moral law, for there can be no law without a lawgiver, and a judge to apply and enforce it. They may believe in "the survival of the fittest," but, if they do, rest assured each one will believe that *he* is the fittest to survive, and that he will try to do so as best he can.

The London *Spectator* has lately said, with truth, that "real poverty is least among the causes of socialism. Its causes are rather to be sought in the spread of knowledge, and the decay of faith. Education is sharpening men's faculties, giving them new desires, making them more apprehensive as to the future, and more envious of the rich, at the very time that the increase of skepti-

cism, by depriving them of the hope of immortality, and destroying the ideas of duty, renders them more resolute to enjoy the present."

This is the real trouble. The principle of authority, indispensable in the acquisition and development of every kind of knowledge, has been rejected in matters of faith and morals. The immediate result of this has been the appearance of some two hundred jarring Christian sects in Europe and this country. Is it any wonder that, having been "blown about by every wind of doctrine" for three centuries, the masses outside the Church, should feel inclined to steer clear of all doctrine for the future? God and His law are ignored by nearly every civilized government of the present day. The highest law they recognize is the will of the monarch, or of the majority, for the time being. Religious teaching has been excluded from elementary schools, and positive infidelity has been taught in colleges and universities. For more than a century millions of all classes have drunk in the poison of a literature in part atheistic, in part immoral. Parents having no religious convictions themselves have considered it a duty to prevent their children receiving any till their reason should be matured, and they would be able to choose for themselves. Such children, it is needless to say, have seldom or never adopted any form of religious belief that would put a restraint on the passions they had indulged, and the habits they had formed during the most susceptible period of their lives.

All these causes combined have produced the effect that should have been foreseen: "Truths are decayed from among the children of men." "The time of our life," they say, now, as they said of old, "is short and tedious, and in the end of a man there is no remedy, and no man hath been known to return from hell. For we are born of nothing, and after this we shall be as if we had not been; for the breath in our nostrils is smoke, and speech, a spark to move our heart. Which being put out, our body shall be ashes, and our spirit shall be poured abroad as soft air, and our life shall pass away as the trace of a cloud, and shall be dispersed as a mist, which is driven away by the beams of the sun. . . . . Come, *therefore*, and let us enjoy the good things that are present, and let us speedily use the creatures as in youth. Let us fill ourselves with costly wine, and ointments, and let not the flower of the time pass by us. Let us crown ourselves with roses before they be withered; let no meadow escape our riot." (Wisd., c. 2.)

And, if the roses do not grow in their own gardens, you may be certain these advanced thinkers will pluck them from those of their neighbors.

Another advantage of boards of arbitration would be, that they

would enlighten public opinion as to the merits of any existing controversy about wages between employers and workmen, and thus enable the general community to see to which side its sympathy was due. This, no doubt, would do much towards bringing all such controversies to a speedy and peaceful, if not always a mutually satisfactory settlement. Their views, too, and recommendations would be of the greatest value in framing legislation in regard to the other conditions of labor, such as the hygienic provisions to be made in factories, the precautions to be taken to prevent accidents to workmen, the kind and amount of employment proper for women and children, and other matters affecting the well-being of the laboring classes.

As to the organization of these boards,—whether they should be partly judicial, as in France, or wholly voluntary, as they are at present in England,—opinion here is divided. The tribunal provided by the Wallace bill, lately passed by the legislature of Pennsylvania, is, in its inception and submission of cases, voluntary, but legal in its procedure and awards. Many favor, others condemn it, whilst others still, who have not fully made up their minds in regard to it, are for giving it a fair trial. This would seem to be the more prudent course to adopt. Time will soon tell whether or not its compulsory provisions should be retained, and thus show the utility or the inutility of legislation in regard to labor disputes in this country. This point once settled, the way will be open for the introduction of purely voluntary tribunals like those of England.

With the question of wages is intimately connected that of strikes. Some political economists justify, others condemn these combinations. For my part, I do not see how their legitimacy can be questioned, provided those engaged in them ask only what is just, keep the peace, and do not interfere with the rights of others. Men's labor is at their own disposal, and they have a perfect right to refuse to work for less than what they consider a just compensation. They can do so, if they please, and even work for nothing; but they cannot be compelled to work for any amount of wages. No one questions the right of merchants and manufacturers to refuse to sell their goods at too low a figure, and to hold them for a higher market. Why should not workmen be allowed to do the same with their labor? Some contend that strikes cannot affect wages, as these are regulated solely by the law of supply and demand. This, however, is a mistake, as wages may be increased by lessening the profits of employers. W. T. Thornton, in his work on labor, published in 1869, argues that the trades-unions have raised the wages of laborers in general, and estimates the addition thus made to the aggregate earnings of the workingmen of the

United Kingdom at £9,000,000 per annum. From this it is evident that, if strikes have often failed to accomplish the object aimed at, they have, on the whole, met with very considerable success.

But strikes, it is said, if successful, raise the price of products for the general public, and, whether successful or not, disorganize very often branches of trade with which the strikes have no direct connection, as is particularly the case in regard to strikes in the coal-mines, and on railroads. This is, no doubt, true. Nevertheless, it does not deprive workmen of their right to strike. The public has no more right than their immediate employers to require them to work for insufficient wages, and, as long as their demands are just, it is very often their employers, not they, who are to blame for the rise in prices, and the other disorders referred to. Were employers always satisfied with a fair profit, strikes would be obviated, or soon terminated. This men will hardly do, who, beginning with little or nothing, look forward to being able to retire from business at thirty-five or forty years of age, on a fortune of a quarter or half a million of dollars. The profits that would enable men to do this, are not in the legitimate trade, except under very rare circumstances.

And here we would remind workmen that employers are not always or alone, responsible for the hardships they may have to endure, or the struggles they may be obliged to make, in the battle of life. The landlord, the baker, the butcher, the grocer, and all who furnish them the necessaries of life, may be quite as much in fault as they. Nay, even should the workman obtain an advance of wages, even to the very highest figure the employer can afford to pay, extortionate rents, and extortionate prices for provisions and other necessaries, may make his condition as bad as and worse than it had been before such an advance had been given. Wholesale dealers usually sell on what they call a very narrow margin, trusting to the extent of their sales for a proper return on their investment, but the profits of retailers are sometimes nothing less than startling. In a late number of the Philadelphia *Ledger*, its well-informed New York correspondent says: "As everybody knows, there has been, within the past few weeks, a very decided shrinkage in the prices of many leading articles of domestic consumption, but, up to this time, consumers, it is certain, have derived little or no benefit from it. The retailer gets all the profit, and the profit, in some cases, is simply enormous. Take coffee, for example: While Rio is selling at 7¾ to 8 cents per pound, the retailer receives from 23 to 28 cents; Maracaibo, 10 cents at wholesale, retail 25 to 30 cents; Java, 15 to 16 cents at wholesale, retail 30 to 35 cents. It would be nothing but fair if the retailer were to divide his profits with the customers; but, as far as can be ascer-

tained, there is but little disposition to do this. In sugar and tea, the difference between the wholesale and retail prices is not so marked, but is one, nevertheless, which leaves a largely disproportionate profit to the retailer."

And retailers not only demand and take these extortionate prices for the necessaries of life, they combine to prevent their customers from obtaining them at lower rates. They would "boycott" the wholesale merchant who would sell them to private families at wholesale prices.

Now, as this state of things may exist in any and every city and town in this country, might it not be well for trades-unions to give it a share of their attention? Certain it is that, as long as it does exist, the only persons likely to derive any real advantage from strikes, or from a rise in wages, are landlords and shop-keepers. But if workmen will persist in fighting the battles of these gentlemen, under the delusion that they are fighting their own, that is their affair.

Though allowable and right in principle, strikes are sometimes wrong in practice. Those engaged in them, whilst asserting and maintaining their own rights, should not assail those of others. This they do when they attempt, by force, to prevent men working at lower wages than they themselves are willing to accept. Every one has the natural right to hire his labor on any terms that are satisfactory to himself, and no man, or set of men, can deprive him of his right. This is a plain truth which workmen should be the very last to call in question.

Strikers have, in the absence of positive laws or ordinances to the contrary, as much right to parade the streets as any other bodies of men assembled for a lawful purpose. Nevertheless, parades of this kind may lead to trouble, especially in cities and towns unprovided with a sufficient police force. It is not to be presumed that those who organize them intend any violation of the peace. They, generally speaking, have too much sense for anything of the kind. But they should remember that it is not in their power to control the idle and excitable crowds that such demonstrations bring together. Would it not be well, then, on prudential grounds, to abstain from displays of strength, that, at best, can do little or no good, and that may bring discredit on the cause they are intended to serve? In a free country, the rioter is detested only a little less than the rebel. We have not policemen at every street corner. We have not soldiers in every city and town, whose very presence would be sufficient to overawe would-be disturbers of the peace. But he who would infer from this that the American people are indifferent to its preservation, would mistake them very much. Tolerant, often too tolerant, of other vio-

lations of law, the one crime they will not overlook is, open resistance to civil authorities. Whether its emblem be the national flag, or a tin star on the breast of a special policeman, they will uphold that emblem, and at any cost. Cowardly mobs may strike down the few representatives of civil authority to be found in our cities, but, in so doing, they strike at a nation that, in turn, will trample them under foot, and hold to a strict account the men and the organizations that gave occasion to their lawlessness. With us the humblest officer of the law represents the majesty and power of the whole American people, and this people can send to his support any force that may be necessary to uphold him in the discharge of his duty. If the local police cannot do this, the State militia are at hand. If these do not suffice, a roll-call of regulars and volunteers, longer than that of the Army of the Potomac, is in the hand of the chief magistrate. It is, then, as foolish as it is criminal in mere mobs to assail an authority which, however weak it may seem in its immediate representatives, is, in its reserved power, simply irresistible.

We do not flatter ourselves that the views here advanced on the relations of capital and labor will meet with universal or unqualified approval among employers or employed. We had not hoped that they would. In what we have written, our sole aim has been to bring out some of the principles that underlie this important subject, and, by so doing, throw as much light as we could on the difficulties it presents to ordinary thinkers. There are men who "love darkness rather than the light," and who, if the light be forced upon them, will sin against it. There are employers and workmen who will take advantage of each other, whenever or howsoever they can, regardless of well-understood right and duty. On men of this class, reason, argument, is thrown away. "They will not understand that they may do well." And even when they do understand, they will do wrong. Knowledge is power, but it is not virtue. It is power for evil as well as for good. There are others, and we would fain hope they are the majority, who need only to have the right made clear to them, to adhere to it, and who, in cases of doubt and difficulty, are ready to adopt any fair, equitable means of adjustment. It is these we have had in our thought in preparing this article, and we are not without hope of having penned something that may help them to a solution of a few, at least, of the difficulties connected with the subject we have attempted to discuss.

ENGLISH ADMINISTRATION IN IRELAND TO-DAY.

TO a stranger visiting Ireland there are few things more striking than the complete distinction between the government and the people. Elsewhere, whatever be its form, the government is supposed to exist for the people's benefit, and to depend for its continuance on the national prosperity. In Ireland the case is entirely different. The government is simply a class of officials dependent for their appointment and pay on the English ministry, and indifferent alike to the wants or the feelings of the country. Many of them are total strangers to it, and, almost without exception, all profess strong dislike to anything distinctively Irish or national. In official circles the public funds are habitually spoken of as the property of the government, and any application of them to Irish purposes as acts of generosity. The people, or at least the majority of the population, are constantly described as a lawless crowd, whose unreasonable dislike of government must be kept in check by force. Their religion is a badge of inferiority in most of the higher offices, and any strong national sympathies are looked on as nearly if not absolutely criminal. The law is regarded as an essential part of the government in the sense of the official administration, and it is expected that government interests shall be paramount to all other considerations in the action of the legal functionaries. Strangely to American ideas, the representatives of the popular majority in Parliament are ever and always regarded as the natural enemies of what is known as the government. As for the minor representative bodies, such as the municipalities, and the poor-law boards, an important part of the work of the government officials is to keep them from committing errors. That the popular representatives must be unfit to govern is a cardinal principle of action in the government circles. They admit that some representation is needed to give the country a legal resemblance to England, but they hold that such representation shall be always under the control of the officials appointed by the English ministry.

One would be astray, however, in supposing that the Irish government represents the politics of the ruling ministry in England. In theory it may, but in practice the Irish executive is a permanent body of officials, holding office for life, and regulating its actions mainly by official traditions handed down from generation to generation. The Lord Lieutenant, the Secretary for Ireland, the Lord Chancellor, and a few others, are all that are changed with a change of government. The heads of the various departments,

among which the work of the executive is divided, remain on for life, and often defy Parliament to interfere with their "vested interests." In Ireland the management of a public office, such as national education, is looked on as a piece of property, to which the rights of its official managers are sacred, and the needs of the public service altogether secondary. In this way it comes that the traditions and practices of the old penal times are preserved in Ireland for fifty or sixty years after the penal laws have been effaced from the statute-books. Catholics are still looked on as highly ineligible for important offices, and especially for the magistracy, though they form nearly four-fifths of the whole population. The still older tradition of discouraging Irish manufactures, which was the approved official practice under William of Orange, is also preserved to a considerable extent, and even increased. There is comparatively little new legislation in Ireland, as may well be supposed when the only legislative body is a Parliament which has to make laws for the whole British Empire. The judiciary is much more closely connected with the executive than in either England or the United States. The Lord Chancellor and most of the superior judges are members of the Privy Council, and the duty of all governmental departments, both legal and executive, supporting one another against the people, is regarded as a matter of course. In this way, the various boards into which the Irish executive is subdivided, enjoy almost complete freedom from either legislative or judicial interference. Each in its sphere is nearly absolute, and though combined action for any useful purpose is hard to be obtained among them, action of any energetic kind is not considered advisable in government circles. To draw pay, discharge routine duties, and make no innovations, are the sum total of ordinary official duties. Whether the country thrives or is ruined, is nothing to its officials, whose pay is drawn from the English treasury, into which the Irish contributions are emptied. It is often said that the prosperity of a country is little affected by its government. A brief study of the existing *régime* in Ireland, and the material ruin which has gone on, deepening under its influence for nearly forty years, would dissipate such an idea. We shall merely point out the chief branches of its administration and their character, and leave our readers to judge.

As there are no county governments, properly speaking, a good deal of the functions performed by such bodies, where they exist, devolves in Ireland on the grand juries. These are appointed by the sheriff of each county at will from the rate-payers whose annual valuation exceeds one hundred pounds, leased property. Beyond selecting them from the different baronies, the sheriff has no restriction in law on his choice. Custom, however, which in the

country parts of Ireland is more powerful than law, prescribes that the grand jurors shall be only selected from the "gentry," that is, from the landlords or their agents, with occasionally a few wealthy farmers or merchants intermixed. As the sheriffs are themselves appointed invariably from the same class by the Lord Lieutenant, and are changed from year to year, the class constitution of the grand juries has been steadily preserved through all the Irish agitations. Besides their duties of finding or throwing out bills for crimes, the Irish grand juries have to allow or reject claims for compensation for injuries and malicious mischief. As in such cases it is common to allow exemplary damages, that is to say, amounts exceeding the actual losses sustained, their power to aid friends is very great. The number of claims for compensation allowed to persons of the same class or political views as the grand jury, is usually very much larger than to any other section of the community. In like manner when a "respectable" person is charged with a crime, it is usual to give him the benefit of doubt where any exists, while the opposite rule is applied to persons who only belong to the farming or working classes. Though the Catholics form nearly four-fifths of the whole population of Ireland and are the majority in twenty-seven of its thirty-two counties, in some amounting to nearly forty to one, there is, we believe, no instance of a grand jury containing a majority of Catholics known, except in a few cities. On an average they run from four or five to ten per cent. of the whole, and of course are utterly powerless on a division.

The practice of having the grand jurors as well as the magistrates and most other officials drawn almost exclusively from one religious body, the Episcopalians, who number about a ninth of the population, gives a striking illustration of the manner in which the influence of the penal laws of the last century is still kept up at the present day. The law declares that the Irish Catholics are entitled to equal rights with any other class of their countrymen, but it makes no provision for distributing the various offices according to right. *They* are assigned to-day as they were when a judge ruled that "the law did not recognize the existence of a Papist in the country." The legal Protestants down to the Emancipation had a monopoly of the local government by law. The danger of a civil war and the reprobation of the civilized world compelled the abrogation of that law, but almost the same monopoly is now upheld by official custom. Such, in this respect, is the religious equality enjoyed by Irish Catholics in 1882. The dominant caste still exists with two badges, landlordism and Protestantism of the once legal type, and it still holds a fast grip on the local administration.

In addition to their legal functions, the grand juries have control of the public works of each county, such as roads, bridges and public buildings, for the maintenance of which they levy a county cess. Its total amount in Ireland is about six million dollars annually. The patronage of this is almost wholly left to the juries, and in awarding contracts they occasionally take personal considerations into account quite openly. Thus, near Dublin last year, bids from responsible parties were rejected on the ground of their having been Land Leaguers, and much higher tenders accepted from contractors belonging to the landlord class. The public funds are thus at the disposal of a class entirely distinct from the tax-payers. How admirably calculated such a system is to maintain class bitterness and to discourage local improvements, may be easily judged.

The relief of the poor and the maintenance of the public hospitals are provided for by a distinct system of local taxation known as the poor rates. Its amount varies from year to year, but on an average it is nearly the same as the county cess levied for public works. It was, we believe, about five and a half million dollars in 1881. For its levy the country is divided into poor-law unions, distinct from the baronies. Its administration is intrusted to the boards of guardians elected by the rate-payers, being, with the exception of the municipalities, almost the only instance of popular representation in the administration of the country. So jealous, however, is the government of any popular management of Irish affairs, that besides the elected members an equal number of magistrates are appointed by virtue of office in each ward. These ex-officio guardians seldom meddle with the actual business details, but usually take an active part in dividing the patronage of the public rates. Nevertheless, the superior energy and generally greater intelligence of the elected members frequently outweighs the organization of the official representatives. The boards of guardians are thus almost the only centres of political life in the country districts of Ireland, and, on the whole, their administration is much superior to that of the grand juries; nevertheless, their power is extremely limited. The amount they can levy, the mode in which relief is to be administered, and the very diet of the poor-houses is prescribed by law; and all their acts are subject to the approval of a body of three commissioners appointed by the Lord Lieutenant, and known as the Local Government Board. The latter examines the accounts of the boards of guardians, and may charge the chairman of each with the amount of any items it objects to. They have also the power to discharge, without reason given, any officer of a union, or even to suspend the whole body of guardians and appoint others in their place. This distrust of elected bodies is a characteristic feature of the whole administra-

tion of Irish affairs. That appointed officials can do no wrong seems to be a maxim of "the powers that be" in Ireland. They have acted on it consistently for over three centuries, and they act on it to-day. It is remarkable that after so long an experience the belief of the Irish people on this point is in direct opposition to that of their rulers.

The system of legal relief for the destitute poor is a modern feature in the Irish administration, having only been established in 1838, in a great part through the exertions of O'Connell; nevertheless the board which controls it has been handed over, as completely as the older departments, to the class which formerly described itself as the Protestant ascendency party. The majority of the commissioners that compose the local government board belong to that class, and from it are also drawn almost exclusively the higher officials, who under the name of inspectors and auditors examine the accounts and actions of the elected boards of guardians, and ratify or reject them at discretion. No qualifications are required for these appointments, the rate of pay for which is nearly four thousand dollars a year each, beyond the personal favor of the local government board. Anything like sympathy with the popular will in politics is, of course, an insuperable obstacle in the way of attaining one of these well-paid offices. In relieving the destitute poor of Ireland the closest attention is paid to economy by the officials. The quality and quantity of the food they may receive is strictly regulated by acts of the Imperial Parliament. Cornmeal porridge, potatoes, bread and milk, in limited quantities, form the staple of the diet allowed in the workhouses, meat being almost unknown. In general it is forbidden to the boards of guardians to grant relief to any one except on condition of entering the workhouses, unless those institutions are too full to receive additional inmates. On entering, parents and children, husbands and wives are separated, and allowed no intercourse with one another in their daily life. Tasks are allotted to the inmates of the workhouses at the discretion of the superintendents and guardians, and they are not allowed to leave those tasks or absent themselves from the house without permission from the superintendent. A peculiar uniform, of coarse stuff, is provided for the inmates, resembling that of prisoners. In fact the chief difference between life in an Irish workhouse and life in a prison consists in the lower scale of food provided for the honest poor. The proportion of the population receiving relief at the public expense is much smaller in Ireland than in England or Scotland, in spite of the poverty of the population. In Ireland, last year, about one hundred and twelve thousand persons, or one in every forty-five of the population, were receiving public aid. In England and Wales the

number was over eight hundred thousand, or one to every thirty inhabitants. Whenever outdoor relief is granted to the poor, special care is taken to prevent its being excessive. In Dublin, shortly before last Christmas, about eight hundred persons were getting public assistance outside the workhouses. The sum allowed for the support of each was between fifty and sixty cents a week. Deaths from starvation and famine fever have been more numerous in Ireland than in any part of Europe since the establishment of the English poor law system.

The Irish common schools are under the control of another board, appointed by the English ministry, without any qualifications for such a trust. The commissioners are twenty in number, all belonging to the landlord or official class, and, of course, wholly free from any popular sympathies. Unlike the local government board, however, half of the education commissioners are Catholics, not, of course, representative Catholics, but simply officials professing the Catholic faith. The greater part of the commissioners do nothing whatever, and the whole management is left in the hands of a paid commissioner, whose decisions are practically law in educational matters. The national schools, as they are called, are subject to no local representative body. A manager, in the person of some influential resident, is recognized for each by the board, and by the manager the teachers are appointed and dismissed at pleasure, but the public of the district has no voice in the matter. The schools are visited and examined semi-annually by official inspectors, but any attempt at introducing improvements, except ordered by the central board, is vigorously repressed. A cast-iron system of regulations is imposed on the schools, without regard to local requirements. The only books allowed are a series prepared in great part forty-five years ago. It may be added that any reference to Irish history or nationality is strictly forbidden in the Irish schools. In fact, though the Irish language is spoken by nearly a million of the population, it is only within the last few years that elementary teaching in that language has been permitted, and no provision whatever has been made for training teachers in the language, or supplying books in it to the pupils.

The organization of the whole system of education for Ireland was originally intrusted to a Scotch Presbyterian clergyman, who conducted a private academy in Dublin. His assistants took charge of the normal school (there is only one such establishment for the whole of Ireland), and succeeded in imprinting such a character on it that, for some years back, the Catholic teachers, who form three-fourths of the whole number, have given up frequenting it. Thus, trained teachers are extremely few, and the number is decreasing rapidly. The system, however, being independent of the public

will, makes no attempt to modify the objectionable features of its training. During a good many years, the board was in the hands of a Protestant majority. The Rev. Mr. Carlyle, the Scotch clergyman already alluded to, was its first chief, and prepared many of the school series imposed on the country. Two Catholic officials out of a board of seven was then considered ample religious equality for the creed of four-fifths of the population. The numbers were subsequently increased to six in a board of fifteen members. The Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Whately, who, in virtue of his office, was a leading member of the Irish executive, was also appointed to the educational board, on its formation in 1831. His Grace had just been brought over from England to occupy the See of Dublin, in accordance with the practice alluded to, a century before, by Swift, in the lines:

> "Our law and our Church dear England maintains,
> For which all true Protestant hearts should be glad,
> She sends us our judges, our bishops, and deans,
> And better she'd give us, if better she had."

The system of national education, in the administration of which Dr. Whately was the most prominent personage, had been established avowedly in consequence of the failure of previous legislation in favor of exclusively Protestant schools for the Irish people.

Lord Stanley, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, expressly stated that, in the new system, the most scrupulous care should be taken not to interfere with the peculiar tenets of any description of Christian pupils. Dr. Whately proceeded to carry out this principle by preparing a series of Scriptural extracts, Protestant hymns, lessons on Christian evidences, and the history of religious worship, which were introduced into all the schools under the control of the board. At the same time, Catholic works were strictly excluded, and by this means, as privately acknowledged by himself, the good Archbishop hoped quietly to achieve the object of rooting out Catholicity from Ireland. The board of education was left under his influence for about twenty-two years, with the natural result of awakening strong public suspicion and dislike of its administration. In fact, at present the model schools, corresponding to the high schools in America, which are all under the direct management of the board, are avoided by the great majority of the people, as anti-Catholic and un-national! Nearly four-fifths of the present population of Ireland, it may be added, are Catholics. The total amount spent last year on public education in Ireland was about three million seven hundred thousand dollars. Men teachers receive salaries ranging from one hundred and seventy-five to three hundred and fifty dollars; females, from one hundred

and thirty-five to two hundred and ninety dollars. The average pay in Ireland for teachers is almost exactly half what it is in England. The deficiency of popular education in Ireland is looked on by the English ministry as a weighty objection to granting any measures of home rule in that country.

University education in Ireland has a much more definite legal character than in America. University graduates have special representatives in Parliament; and, though not absolutely indispensable, university certificates are of the utmost importance in obtaining admission to the professions of law or medicine. In fact, the employment of an unlicensed medical practitioner is considered a gross piece of lawlessness by the Irish tribunals. The only university in Ireland, down to 1849, was Trinity College, which was under the control of the state church. It was not only Protestant, but its teachers were obliged, before admission to their chairs, to take an oath denouncing the religion of a majority of their countrymen as "damnable and idolatrous." Catholics, however, might attend their lectures on paying the usual fees, but they were excluded from all the scholarships, fellowships, and other prizes of the college. That this arrangement was somewhat unfavorable, and even unjust, towards four-fifths of the nation, was freely admitted by the government at the beginning of the century. In less than fifty years afterwards they attempted to partially remedy it by the foundation of the Queen's University, which differed from Trinity in admitting Catholics as professors, in limited numbers. In Belfast College, indeed, the theory was the only difference, as no Catholic was appointed on the staff, though Catholics were the majority of the population of the province of Ulster. The new university was also more strictly official and anti-national than Trinity College, and, in consequence, its failure was admitted by the government after thirty years' experience, and a new establishment founded in 1880. This admits students of any college or creed to university honors and degrees if they only possess the needed literary qualifications. That the government should have sanctioned such a principle, after only eighty years' experience, is a striking proof of the progressive nature of the Irish administration. The want of men of culture among the mass of the Irish people is frequently given by the Protestant gentry and members of Parliament as an evidence of their natural unfitness for self-government.

The danger of correcting admitted abuses too hastily is a constant source of apprehension to the Irish administration. Its dealings with the education question are a good example of its way of avoiding such a risk. During the penal laws, when Catholics had no legal existence, the public endowments for education were nat-

urally confined to the legal Protestants. Circumstances beyond the control of government compelled the repeal of the penal laws at different times, and, in consequence, it was found that three-fourths of the population were Catholics as a matter of fact. As they, in consequence, were liable to look for some share in the public funds, the government deemed it right to regard that portion which had been set apart for education as private property of the dominant sect. In this way a body numbering about one-ninth of the Irish people, retained control of university education for fifty years, and still retains the lands originally set apart for its support. The estates of Trinity College are nearly two hundred thousand acres, or one per cent. of the whole soil of Ireland. They were granted originally for public purposes. Government made a small sect the legal public by the penal laws, and the public endowments have remained with that sect since. The tendency of Irishmen to recur to the evils of past legislation, whose character no person now defends, is looked on by the English public as strong evidence of the unpractical and sentimental character of Irish grievances.

In no department is the peculiar nature of the English administration better illustrated than in the eminently practical one of Irish public works. Their intimate connection with the material prosperity of the country is fully recognized by the practical English people. Indeed, that commerce must largely depend in any country on its harbors, its roads, railroads, and canals; that the overflow of rivers in flood-time must materially affect agricultural interests; that protective legislation is necessary to prevent the destruction of fisheries, and that all these are essentially public works, no one who pays a moment's attention to the question will attempt to deny. In America the people are so trained to the practice of self-government in all the details of public life, that it is hard to realize how completely the control of works such as we have just mentioned is vested in the executive central government in Ireland. A railroad cannot be constructed, or a public tramway laid down, a river cannot be deepened or embanked, water-works cannot be established for the smallest town, nor a harbor be formed for shipping without special acts of Parliament. The cost of obtaining such is always considerable, for it must be held in mind that "lobbying," under the name of parliamentary agency, is a strictly legal institution in the British empire. But the obtaining an enabling act for such works by no means ends the interference of government in every part of their working. The raising of money to carry them out, the countless questions of private rights affected, the variations that may be needed from original plans, and a thousand other points, which here are determined by arbitration or the

public interest, are in Ireland reserved for the decision of the central executive. It must be borne in mind that home rule is declared to be wholly inconsistent with the maintenance of the present governmental system, and home rule is prohibited not only in Parliament, but also in local affairs. As it is impossible for Parliament to superintend all the details of such works, its functions in that line are, according to the usual plan, delegated in Ireland to a board.

The functions of the board of works are twofold. It "interprets" in official language the acts of Parliament relating to railroads, drainage, canals, and generally to the spending or lending of public money on national works. Thus, when permission has been granted to build a railroad by act of Parliament, the board of works afterwards has to examine the plans and surveys, and decide whether they provide adequately for the improvement of the district traversed. It also appoints arbitrators to condemn any lands required for such works. In fact, questions relating to river navigation, drainage, the building of harbors and docks, water works, and even a good deal of the late land acts are under the complete control of this body. For instance, in 1870, Parliament passed a law, by which tenant-farmers might obtain loans from the state, repayable by instalments, for the part purchase of their holdings. The board at once fixed the smallest loan that would be issued at such a figure that very few tenants could take advantage of it. Nullification, of this description, is a favorite practice with Irish boards.

Extensive as is the field of operations thus appointed to the board of works, no check is maintained over its action. Its annual expenditure is about one million of dollars, the greater part being on such government buildings as barracks, prisons, coast guard stations, and courts. Most of the work, in connection with these, is done by contract. From evidence given by the board itself before a Parliamentary committee, it seems to be looked on as quite unnecessary to award such to the lowest responsible bidder. Relatives of officials, being better known to the board, get a preference in many such cases. The architect employed by them also acts openly as chairman of a Dublin building society, though a treasury law expressly forbids officials from engaging in private works. Breach of the law by officials, however, is not regarded as lawlessness in Ireland, and entails no punishment. The board simply admits the fact, and does nothing. To prevent trouble and save expense, no official meetings of the board itself are held, nor is it considered needful to publish any accounts of its transactions.

The body, thus vested with the management of Irish works, is not numerous. It consists of a Scotch colonel and an Irish en-

gineer, both holding office for life, and quite irresponsible to any tribunal. It is complained that the slowness with which business in the department is transacted has a bad effect on the public prosperity. One example may be given: A canal was cut by the board between Lough Erne and the Shannon during the years between 1846 and 1859. The total cost from public and private sources was two hundred and twenty-eight thousand pounds, about eleven hundred thousand dollars. On its completion, it was handed over to local trustees, whose engineer pronounced it wholly useless for traffic from its faulty construction. The board received the engineer's report in 1860, and simply declined to answer. The facts of the case were finally published after only *eighteen* years, and the charge of the engineer was fully admitted. The canal, of course, had been useless, and continues so, but it is pleasant to learn that the board of works draws its pay with perfect regularity. Its officials are all men of recognized "integrity" and extremely outspoken in condemning any waste of public funds on poor relief.

The tendency of the Irish people to depend on the aid of government in all their public undertakings is a point which is frequently urged in England, and especially in Parliament. The board of works has naturally to cope with this tendency, and it does so very effectively. In 1878, before the land agitation commenced, a curious official report was published by Parliament, showing the amount spent, and loaned respectively towards Irish railroads, harbors, drainage, inland navigation, and fishery piers. These, it may be seen, include pretty nearly everything which, in America, would be regarded as public works. The actual amount spent on the whole, out of the Imperial funds, averaged *twenty-five* thousand dollars a year. Loans were granted on good security to railroads, to the amount of about thirty-five thousand pounds a year; towards harbors and piers, of something like six thousand pounds a year; and towards drainage works, of about nineteen thousand pounds. These, however, were all secured by first mortgages on the property, and thus the sole amount actually spent was on piers for fishing-boats along the west coast. Twenty-five thousand dollars were annually employed on such works, but since 1880 this grant has been discontinued for a characteristic reason. The Canadian Government made a grant for the relief of Irish distress, and, as the erection of piers was found the most effectual way of aiding the poorest and most industrious class of the people, a hundred thousand dollars of that money were applied to such works. The board of works, in consequence, has thought it best to withdraw the customary grant of aid of the fishermen for a few years, on the grounds of economy. The total yearly revenue

raised from Ireland, for Imperial purposes, is somewhat near thirty-six millions of dollars.

On a review of the various functions of the board of works, it will be seen how few enterprises of an industrial character are exempt from its jurisdiction. There are, however, a few such, and as a specimen of the mode in which the action of the administration is brought to bear on them, the Dublin exhibition of 1882 may serve as an example. A number of Irish manufacturers and merchants, having the Lord Mayor of Dublin at their head, determined to get up a display of Irish manufactures, with a view to their encouragement. They excluded politics of every shade, and avoided any demand on the government, either for help or patronage. The result was peculiar. The exhibition was denounced by the official class as disloyal, and the whole power of its friends was directed to preventing its being held. On the completion of the building by popular subscriptions, which amounted to a hundred and fifty thousand dollars, the government suddenly issued a circular to the constabulary through the country directing them to take the names of all persons supposed to come up to visit the Dublin exhibition. As the police had power to arrest any one at pleasure, it was hoped thus to deter visitors from the disloyal though quite legal exhibition. A threatened resignation of the whole police force, which occurred simultaneously, owing to official ill treatment of that body, prevented the benevolent designs of the authorities from being carried out, nor was it renewed. The character of the attempt is strikingly typical of the system of rule in Ireland.

The police administration of Ireland is organized on a plan quite distinct from that of any other country. No local or municipal police are allowed to be organized. The executive provides a force of about twelve thousand, armed and drilled in military style, who are expected to discharge all the duties of enforcing the law throughout the country. An inspector commands in each county, with five or six sub-inspectors under him. These are the commissioned officers of the force and are highly paid, and selected from the class of gentry almost exclusively. The sub-inspectors obtain their appointments by competitive examinations, in which Latin, Greek, English literature and various similar studies form the tests. The close connection of those subjects with a police officer's duties, illustrates the highly practical character of the Irish administration. It is also a fairly adequate precaution against persons not belonging to the wealthier classes finding admission. The combination of literary and military tastes is naturally confined to such; but to prevent the danger of poor men slipping into the service by merely literary ability, another remarkable test is added. Before a candidate is eligible for appointment as sub-

inspector, his family must guarantee him a salary of fifty pounds a year, during a period of probation as a cadet. The unaccountable manner in which mere ability is usually combined with prejudices against the existing system of government in Ireland, unless its possessor is strongly interested from practical motives in its support, is a sufficient explanation of this remarkable rule. The constables are recruited from the farming classes and receive about double the pay of soldiers in the army. The only precaution taken with them is, that they shall never be employed in their own county, and that in each barrack men of different districts and religious persuasions shall be grouped together. The duties of the force are not usually heavy. They drill for about an hour each day and patrol the roads for a few hours in the evening. The peculiar arrangements adopted for keeping them apart from the population, naturally renders them almost wholly inefficient in arresting criminals. As, however, there is little ordinary crime in the country, that is a matter of secondary importance, unless in times of disturbance. Times of disturbance, in the official sense, usually occur in Ireland about every nine or ten years and last three or four. The officials and judges say they are wholly unaccountable for by any natural causes. The usual remedy applied is a coercion law. The habeas corpus act is suspended, men are imprisoned on suspicion for unlimited periods, and fines are levied on the disaffected district. The last is much recommended by the officials, but a serious obstacle to its application is found in the increasing poverty of the country. Just before Christmas an application was made to levy a hundred thousand dollars in taxation off a district in Galway and Mayo, where a Mr. Burke had been murdered. At the same time, it was found impossible to recover the poor rates, in a large part of the district, the people being penniless. The problem of how to levy taxation on a destitute population is one on which the whole intelligence of the Irish administration has been engaged for some time, but the solution arrived at has not yet been made public. We may remark that the total cost of the Irish constabulary is rather large, amounting to nearly seven millions of dollars for the past year. Three million six hundred thousand are spent on popular education. The average cost of a school teacher is very close to one-half that of a police officer, and their numbers are nearly the same.

The boards which we have described are the real government of Ireland at present. It will be seen that the system is a quite peculiar one. It has grown up entirely since Catholic Emancipation. The penal laws having then been abandoned, the English government had to decide between letting the Irish people manage their own affairs or devising a new system for governing

them. The board system was invented in consequence, and since the death of O'Connell and the abandonment of the repeal movement, the boards have practically had absolute sway in every department of the government of Ireland. How the country has thriven under them, a few figures will show. The area of cultivated land was nearly six million acres in 1851. In 1881 it had fallen to less than three millions two hundred thousand. During the preceding ten years, six hundred thousand acres fell out of cultivation. During the same period there absolutely had been a decrease of twenty thousand cattle, about a million of sheep, and over half a million of hogs. The fisheries of Ireland employed a hundred and ninety thousand men and boys in 1847. They fell to twenty-four thousand in thirty years. Mines and miners shared the same fate in a lesser degree. The population had gone down by uninterrupted decreases from eight millions two hundred thousand to five millions one hundred and seventy thousand. The wealth of the country at the time of the union was estimated at one-ninth of that of England. At present, judged by the income tax returns, the amount of funds held in Ireland, and the value of Irish and English railways, it is about one-twentieth. No class in Ireland is exempt from the general decay. Ulster, during the last ten years especially, has actually suffered the greatest losses of any province.

Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Catholics have suffered alike, both in numbers and in wealth. The ruin which has fallen on Ireland is wholly unknown in any other country of the modern world. Like its form of government it is wholly peculiar to Ireland, and whether the latter be its true cause or not we leave our readers to judge for themselves. To govern Ireland by English ideas has been for three centuries the object of the English government. It has carried out its policy unchecked for nearly two. The moral result has been the most infamous penal code known to man; the intellectual, to reduce to ignorance a country which was once the school of Western Europe; and the material, to inflict on it a ruin, such as has never before been witnessed in a Christian land.

From the facts we have stated, it may be judged how eminently practical a question is the demand of the Irish people for home rule. They simply ask that the system which is crushing them shall be removed. They demand that the representatives of the people shall replace the foreign boards which control every branch of public life, that the laws shall be made by the people who live under them and shall be administered by men of their own approving. With less than this they cannot live in their land. The choice is home rule or extermination. The land question, on which

so much has been written, is but one branch of Irish grievances. The whole system of English government is ruinous to Ireland. The English Parliament is powerless to remedy its defects in detail, but so long as it retains control of Irish affairs, it will be forced by the current of events to occupy itself with them and their results. Already it has been forced to sacrifice half its freedom of debate to the exigencies of Irish politics. It must sacrifice the whole before it can hope to suppress the complaints of the Irish people. If the English people will not allow the Irish to be partners in self-government, they must themselves accept a partnership in centralized thraldom. We shall see what choice they will make.

CONVERTS—THEIR INFLUENCE AND WORK IN THIS COUNTRY.

An account of the Conversion of the Rev. Mr. John Thayer, lately a Protestant minister at Boston, in North America. Baltimore, 1788.

Apology for the Conversion of Stephen Cleveland Blyth. New York, 1815.

History of my own Times. By the Rev. Daniel Barber. Washington, 1827.

The Reasons of J. J. M. Oertel, late a Lutheran minister, for becoming a Catholic. New York, 1840.

Trials of a Mind. By L. S. Ives. Boston, 1854.

Path which led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church. By P. H. Burnett. New York, 1860.

THERE is something terrible in the results of heresy, as we study those results in the history of the Church. It ever carries with it a deadly blight. The dogma denied, in some cases, may seem one of less vital importance, compared to the whole deposit of the faith, the form of Church government may be retained, a hierarchy perpetuated, the holy sacrifice offered, but the breaking away from unity is attended with a blindness, life and light die out, the branch cut off from the parent stem, no longer traversed by the vivifying sap, withers and perishes.

Where any country or large district has accepted a heresy, there is scarcely an instance in history where it has ever recovered from the fatal step and returned to the faith. Gradually one doctrine after another, one devotional safeguard after another is lost, the Christian life sinks, flickers, flutters and is gone. In the East the

lands won by the Arian, the Nestorian, the Monophysite became the prey of the Mohammedan, and Christianity died out utterly. In the West, where the hierarchs Wicklif, Huss and Luther denied the dogmas on which the theory of the Church, the divine worship and the channels of divine grace rested, the countries in which they obtained sway began a downward course, gradually yielding up all the Christianity they first retained, till the personality of God, supernatural religion, revelation, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the fall of man, redemption through a Saviour, are rejected in the nineteenth century as absolutely as the authority of the Church or the Real Presence was in the sixteenth.

No country has ever renounced a single error or made a single step towards a return to the truth. Self-exiled from paradise they seem cut off by a sword of flame from all return. The doctrines they profess all seem lightly held but one, and that is the belief that the Church is false and wrong and dangerous. A thousand new errors and differences may arise, but this point is never questioned. In their eyes the Church is ever in the wrong. Men may hold the very doctrine she maintains, yet will insist that she is and must be wrong. When Pope Pius IX. solemnly defined the belief, so long clearly and openly held, that the Blessed Virgin was free from original sin from the first instant of her existence as a human being, from her conception, there was a wild storm of denunciation. Yet thousands who reviled the doctrine believed it, as firmly as any Catholic did, for as thousands and thousands in every Protestant country had ceased to believe the doctrine of original sin, they believed that all men were conceived and born free from any taint of any original sin of Adam, and believing this of all men, they necessarily believed it of the Blessed Virgin, and if questioned would admit that they believed her to be free from the sin of Adam. They really agreed with Catholics in regard to her case, though they were at variance with us in regard to the condition of the rest of the human race.

It is an example of that terrible spiritual blindness, that veil over the heart, which is the result of heresy, and which makes the return of a country or a race seem virtually impossible, and makes the return of an individual born under its shadow, a miracle of divine grace.

In some countries men know that their ancestors were forced from the Catholic Church by penal laws, by the halter, the stake, by torture, by confiscation, by privation of all religious guides, yet human argument, human eloquence, the clearest evidence, fail to reveal to their minds the truth of the old faith, and they seem to require like Saul to be hurled, dazed and blinded, to the very dust, before the light of the Sun of Justice can penetrate into their souls.

If a Catholic priest, a zealous layman were to attempt to present

the truth to them, prejudice would raise such an impenetrable barrier that conviction would be hopeless. A Mormon missionary or the Leatherwood God might go into a Protestant community and make converts, but a Catholic missionary would only excite the deepest and bitterest hatred of the faith he proclaimed. Grace must do its work first: ordinarily speaking, it is only when the poor prodigal, finding that he has nothing but husks for food, says "I will arise and go back to my father's house," that the priest can go forth to meet him.

Yet from the time when the Germanic nations, last in Europe to accept the faith and first to reject it, fell into heresy, conversions of individuals, retroversions have gone steadily on. England, Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, all have their long line of those who, faithful to the grace vouchsafed them, returned to the bosom of the Mother Church. There seem to be indeed special seasons when Grace works more powerfully and overcomes the obstacles, not in single minds and hearts, but in whole classes.

This country, in the settlement of nearly all the colonies, was leavened with some form of error which sprang up after the original revolt, and seemed as far removed as possible from the kingdom of God. The Church established by law in England never acquired any strong hold here, and indeed as long as allegiance was acknowledged to the king, he never dared as head of the Church of England to send a bishop to the colonies. But though Anglican, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Lutheran, Dutch Reformed might disagree on other points, they all agreed in hatred of Catholicity, and penal laws were aimed at it in New England, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, Carolina, Georgia.

Yet from the settlement of Maryland, from the appearance of Catholicity, conversions began, and the stream deepens and widens as it comes down to our time.

The gentry who came with Calvert to Maryland and founded the settlement under Lord Baltimore's charter, were almost if not exclusively Catholics, but many of the humbler colonists brought over by the proprietors were Protestants. No minister came to attend them, however. These settlers were as destitute of a Protestant ministry as the Pilgrim Fathers who landed on Plymouth Rock; yet one of Calvert's first acts was to give these Protestants a place and a structure for their religious services. Catholics gave Protestants their first church in Maryland. They were free to follow the practices of their own Protestantism. The Church of England sent no one to them, but they could contrast the zeal of the Catholic priest with the indifference of their own ministers in England, and when at last some of their clergy came to Maryland, the contrast became only sharper, so utterly unfit, as all now acknowledge, were the first Protestant clergy of the province. Men

felt the want of a spiritual guide, and they turned to men whom they had learned to respect, and asked to be instructed in a faith which they saw professed and practiced by men superior to themselves socially and intellectually. A few years showed that almost all the Maryland settlers had become Catholics except those with Claiborne and the Puritans who fled from Virginian persecution.

Thus in 1638 the Jesuit Fathers report: "Among the Protestants nearly all who came out from England in this year 1638, and many others have been converted to the faith, with five mechanics whom we hired for a month, and have in the mean time won to God." In 1640 it is mentioned of Father Philip Fisher, "that many are brought back into the bosom of the Church by his active industry."

In 1673 twenty-eight converts were recorded, and thirty-four the next year.

The greatest tribute to the zeal and success of the Jesuit Fathers is found in the colonial archives of Maryland, in a petition addressed by the Protestant clergy to the Assembly, asking them to repress the Catholic priests, because during a recent epidemic they were assiduous in visiting the sick, and won many to the Catholic faith. No wonder men deserted a system whose ministers made their own cowardice a virtue.

The earliest evidence we have of the presence of priests in Philadelphia is connected with the conversion in 1707, of Lionel Brittain, a prominent and well-to-do personage, and the public celebration of mass at the time; this conquest preceded the entrance of the Jesuits into that province, and was probably due to the Franciscans, who had been sent over to Maryland by the Propaganda some years before. Wherever a priest could penetrate converts were received, some won by the fidelity and zeal of Catholics, able to give an account of the faith which was in them. This was especially the case in Pennsylvania, where many who had joined the strange sects that arose among the German population, turned for peace and rest to the Mother of all the churches.

In New Jersey too a descendant of Nicholas Upsall, the first man in New England who dared to advocate religious toleration, became an humble and devoted Catholic.

On the frontier, many whom the vicissitudes of war carried to Canada, embraced the faith, and not a few Catholic families in Canada to-day are allied by ties of consanguinity with Protestant families in New England.

But in colonial times the Church was everywhere under a ban; a Catholic church was something to be seen nowhere except in Philadelphia and Lancaster; its services were unknown; its grand ritual, so evidently marked with the stamp of divine authenticity, was unknown; its doctrines maligned when mentioned, misrepre-

sented and distorted, with a cowardice so utterly shameless, that it never dared allow the people to read any exposition of the true faith.

Nowhere did Catholicity seem so completely excluded, so hopeless as in the thirteen British colonies in America when a revolution came, hurried on by an intense feeling of anti-Catholic bigotry and fanaticism. Yet so little does all human cunning avail against the wisdom of God, this was but the darkest hour before the dawn, the eve of a wonderful change in favor of the Church.

Mass had been sung on the Kennebec, but the altar was overthrown; mass had been chanted by the picturesque lakes of New York from Lake George to the thunderous Falls of Niagara, but priest and fane were gone; the shrine of Our Lady where the Allegheny weds the Monongahela was laid waste; the sacred rites were suspended at St. Augustine and Pensacola. Who but a madman would have dared to say, Within little more than a score of years selectmen of Boston will publicly go to mass; the gravest citizens of Newport will follow a crucifix through its streets; Philadelphia will see the ablest men of every colony gathered before a Catholic altar; a Catholic chaplain in the service of the colonies offering the great sacrifice of the new law for Catholic troops? And yet what would then seem to be but the raving of a madman, would have been but sober truth.

Catholicity was presented to the people of the United States. The old bigotry and fanaticism were not dead. Some of the leaders of the Revolution were still the base drivelling slaves of the old anti-Catholic bigotry and fanaticism, shutting their eyes to the light and full of fiendish hatred. They kept up the old battle of error, hampered the progress of truth, and retained many in the mazes of ignorance and prejudice. But the Church was free; the holy sacrifice could be offered, and its divine influence extended as the guardian angel of state and town bowed in reverent awe before the altar of the divinest sacrifice; the doctrines of the Church could be openly preached, and by the aid of the press could be presented to all who sought to know the truth.

Men began to examine this religion which their fathers had professed for centuries, the religion of the wise Alfred; of the men who founded Oxford and Cambridge; the religion of the men who fought at Agincourt and Acre; the religion which had made England and Ireland the apostles of Germany and Scandinavia. And when a man begins to examine in good faith, he must yield to the power of truth, unless human considerations lead him to resist the grace given him. The struggle is often great, the pitying angels look on as the strong man falters in spite of their loving aid, unable to break through the net of worldly hopes, inveterate prejudice, phantom fears, and human respect.

Grace triumphs strangely. A young Congregationalist minister of Boston makes a tour of Europe. He is in Rome when a man, little better than a beggar in human eyes, dies there in one of his pilgrimages. The city rings with accounts of the miracles wrought at the humble bier where Labre's lifeless body lies; in a house frequented by English and a few Americans, the laughter and jeer went round at what to most seemed the very zenith of folly. One quiet gentleman dared any one of the company to go, examine some of the cases where cures were said to have been effected, and then come back and, on his honor as an honest man, state what his judgment was as to the fact. An awkward silence succeeded the jeers; the matter-of-fact proposition staggered the would-be wits; the American after a pause bravely declared that he would go and investigate. He took up some of the reported cures, he saw the persons, their physicians, neighbors, public officials, men who were no devotees; the more he examined, the deeper became his conviction that there was no fraud, no trickery, that the Catholic priests had restrained rather than encouraged the people, that in fact the cures were supernatural. He made his report like a man. To the rest, it was a mere matter of the moment; they may have sneered less, or spoken more guardedly; but to Thayer it was the moment of grace. The conviction that miracles were wrought in his day in the Catholic Church made it imperative in his eyes to know what that Church taught, and whether it could command his obedience. A sign had been given; was it a confirmation of the teaching authority of the Church? He conferred with the most learned priests he could find; the light grew clearer and clearer; he embraced the faith, entered the seminary of St. Sulpice at Paris, and returned to America a priest to offer his services to Bishop Carroll. The Rev. John Thayer was the first of the long line of converts whose names are found in the list of American clergy. His account of the motives which led to his embracing the Catholic faith was repeatedly printed here and abroad, and translated into French and Spanish. Its influence was great, and undoubtedly was to many Americans the first glimpse into truth.

He labored in New England and Kentucky, and finally went to Ireland, where his ministry proved most successful. His own land was not forgotten. He collected means to establish a convent and induced ladies connected with the Ursuline order to cross the ocean and found one. Its fate shows how people cling to bigotry and fanaticism and close their eyes to the clearest light of gospel truth.

A remarkable conversion of the latter part of the last century was that of Adam Livingston, a Lutheran living in Pennsylvania, whose house was so molested by supernatural and destructive visitations that he removed to Smithfield, Virginia. His change of abode did not deliver him, and he applied in vain to several Prot-

estant clergymen, whose prayers proved unavailing. At the instance of a Catholic peddler to whom he extended hospitality, he finally called upon the Rev. Denis Cahill, one of the few Catholic clergymen in that part of the country. The exorcisms and prayers of the Church abated the destructive character of the visitations for a time, which the celebration of mass in the house completely terminated. For many years, however, supernatural lights and voices continued. Mr. Livingston was so thoroughly convinced that he with most of his family was received into the Church; he subsequently returned to Pennsylvania and lived in the parish of the Rev. Prince Dimitri Galitzin, who examined carefully the whole evidence, and records his belief in it. Other persons of intelligence made similar investigations, and the main facts are so well established that the place in Virginia where Livingston resided is known to this day by the name of Wizard Clip.

There were, of course, some converts like Samuel Breck, of Boston, who, thrown among Catholics, or educated in Catholic institutions, became converts, believed for a time, and with a change of surroundings lost the faith. Breck was educated at the Benedictine College of Sorèze in France, and became a Catholic. As such he met Rev. Mr. Thayer at St. Sulpice, when the latter had just been ordained a deacon; he promised Thayer to help him establish a Catholic church in Boston, but when Thayer reached Boston as a priest soon after, he found that the new convert had cast his Catholicity aside and was as much a Protestant as ever.

Among other prominent converts of the last century may be mentioned the Hon. Thomas Sim Lee, a patriot of the Revolution, who presided over Maryland from 1779 to 1783, was subsequently a member of the Continental Congress, and of the Constitutional Convention which framed the plan of government under which we live. Amid his engrossing public cares he studied deeply the claims of the Church, and was received into her bosom. It is most creditable that the step excited no odium or bigotry in his native state, which once more made him governor in 1794.

The Episcopal Church, however, by its claim to apostolic succession, and continuous existence from the earliest days, soon showed that many of its members were ill at ease, unable to recognize the Catholic claims which Anglicanism couples with Protestant practices. Episcopalianism had arisen spontaneously in Connecticut, where men went back to the Church of England in order to escape the tyranny of the Congregational denomination, or "Standing Order," as it was termed. It was a providential moment for Connecticut. The Congregationalists, brought face to face with the Episcopalians, were saved from lapsing into Unitarianism, as they did in Massachusetts; they had to retain and uphold what Christianity they still had; and, on the other hand, the Episcopa-

lians, to meet the arguments of the Congregationalists, were compelled to take stronger and stronger Catholic ground. They soon formed a school with decided leanings towards the true Church, which gave us in time many converts. And in the Congregational body many forced to examine, either became Catholics directly, or yielding to Episcopalianism, found ultimately that Rome alone could claim their allegiance.

But the earliest Episcopalian, who in life by her example, and since by her great work has been most illustrious, was not directly influenced by this movement.

Eliza Bayley, daughter of an eminent New York physician, became the wife of William Seton, one of the most prosperous merchants of the time. God tried her in the crucible of affliction. Commercial disasters swept away her husband's wealth, his health failed, and a voyage to Italy was counselled as the only hope. She attended him, surrounding his sick couch with all the care affection could prompt, till she at last closed his eyes in that distant land. Poverty, bereavement, exile were not her only trials; her mind was filled with doubts as to her spiritual condition. The faith in which she had been reared satisfied neither her mind nor her heart. She returned to America with some faint idea that the Catholic Church might give her rest, but still buoyed up with the hope of finding her own system sufficient. Bishop Hobart and some of his clergy, however, failed to meet her doubts; her prayers for light showed her the true path more and more clearly; correspondence with Catholic clergymen gave her the doctrines of the Church as really taught, and she was received into the bosom of the spouse of Christ on the 14th of March, 1805. Her desire to devote herself to Christian education and works of mercy was soon realized, and she founded at Emmettsburg the first American community of Sisters of Charity. The establishments that have grown from her foundation—academies, schools, asylums for every form of human need, hospitals—are counted by the hundred, her spiritual daughters by thousands; the very list of her Sisters of Charity who have laid down their lives while attending the sick during the great epidemics that from time to time have visited our land, were the Sisters not too humble to present such a list, would shame into silence those who sometimes absurdly boast of a purer faith, but never venture to boast of holier deeds.

Men of all creeds and of none began to look to the Church as the real haven of rest,—men, like Stephen C. Blyth, who had examined and studied even Mohammedanism, but found all built of hay and stubble, till he came to the true Church founded on the rock, her whole system logically coherent, worthy of the Most High, and evincing such a knowledge of human wants and miseries that, compared with all others, it must be divine.

Men came, like Stephen Burroughs, who had found the strictest Calvinism of New England no help in the hour of temptation, ineffectual to convert a sinner, condemning him as a reprobate without a single hope of pardon. Catholicity reclaimed him, so that he died in Canada an honored member of society.

Thus from all forms of Protestantism, from those who had broken away from it or whom it had cast out as pariahs, souls were won to God. Many of these early conversions strike us forcibly from the multiplicity of means that the ingenuity of grace seems to have devised:

> Multiformis proditoris
> Ars ut artem falleret;

yet where the enemy of man shows almost inexhaustible resources and wiles for deluding souls, grace must show its divine potency and fertility by its means of thwarting him.

A Methodist clergyman, Rev. John Richards, was sent in 1807 from New York as an itinerant to traverse Western New York and Upper Canada, then sparsely settled districts. He went on his way zealously, with no doubt as to the truth of the doctrines he announced, and, as he made his way eastward in Canada from Niagara, he found that the Catholic religion was actually a thriving denomination there, with priests, nuns, and all the institutions which he supposed had been left far behind in the march of progress. This state of things pained the good man, and he resolved to visit some of the Catholic clergymen in Montreal, and by convincing them of their error, as he supposed he could easily do, restore Canada to Christianity. The Sulpicians at the seminary in Montreal received him affably, and, in the discussions which followed, put into his hands some of the ordinary Catholic doctrinal works. He read and studied with increasing wonder. These were doctrines to be accepted, not to be refuted. Prayer completed the work; he was faithful to grace, and, bidding a kind farewell to his Methodist brethren, he was received into the Catholic Church, became a priest, and labored to an advanced age, dying during the heroic service of the ship fever patients at Montreal.

As remarkable was the conversion of a worthy Quakeress, who entered the sacristy of St. Peter's Church, New York, one morning, while the Rev. Benedict Fenwick was making his thanksgiving after mass. "The Lord hath sent me, brother, to convert thee!" was her startling announcement. "No, sister, he hath sent thee to me to be converted," was his reply; and such proved to be the fact.

When the movement to which we have alluded began in the Episcopal Church, among the first converts were the Rev. Daniel Barber, an old Revolutionary soldier, who, as an Episcopal minister, had baptized a daughter of the free-thinking General Ethan

Allen, but ere long saw her a Catholic and a member of a religious order in Canada. The Rev. Mr. Barber himself soon became a Catholic; his son, the Rev. Virgil Barber, with his wife and children, also embraced the faith, father and son entering the Society of Jesus, while Mrs. Barber and her daughters entered monasteries of the Visitation Order, the whole family blessed with vocation to the faith and to the religious state, and with holy perseverance. The Rev. John Kewley, of St. George's Church, New York, the Rev. George E. Ironside, and others, at that time also embraced the faith; and it is known that Bishop Hobart himself lacked only courage to yield to his own convictions. Meanwhile the influence in Connecticut, especially at Middletown, continued, where the clear mind and deep learning of Rev. Samuel F. Jarvis formed many, who at later date, happier than their teacher, embraced the faith. Among these was James R. Bayley, a nephew of Mother Seton, who became an Episcopal clergyman, but died Archbishop of Baltimore.

Among the laity, too, there were constant conversions, and the few struggling Catholics found new support and strength from the influence of these accessions.

When the struggle for Catholic emancipation in England and Ireland had assumed the form of an agitation, it evoked all the old bitter antagonism to the Church which had for a time lain dormant. From about 1825 the books, pamphlets, and newspapers vilifying the Church increased immensely in number and venom. This country, in its provincial spirit, reproduced and copied the English publications, and there does not exist, in any language, such a mass of degrading moral filth and falsehood as was circulated among Protestants for a quarter of a century by every possible agency.

This was a period of warm controversy. The Church, assailed in every form, was defended with learning and ability, but it was not a period of conversions. Many who had been drawn by conscience toward the Church drew back; some thought it all a terrible delusion. Protestantism made its last dogmatic fight. Till this time it had clung to the old doctrines, but the attempt to maintain them logically as against Catholics failed utterly. Since that epoch there has been a gradual breaking-away in Protestant sects; few adhere to the old standards, or would attempt to prove their old confessions of faith to be divine truth given to man for his guidance to eternal life, or their service a divine Latreia man was bound to offer under pain of sin.

As if admitting that their ground was untenable, the system of attack was changed, and from about 1840 the opposition to the Church became political, and the ballot-box was to be used to check the increase of foreign Catholics as competing workmen, and

later to prevent Catholics from exercising the influence in the country to which their numbers would naturally entitle them.

Conversions, as we have said, were few at this period. Yet there were some, especially among the Protestant immigration. The King of Prussia, forgetting the policy of the great Frederic, resolved to play a part in ecclesiastical matters. He was possessed with the idea of blending all his Protestant subjects into one body. A form of church service, arranged by Bunsen, was issued for both Lutheran and Calvinist churches, alternative portions being inserted to suit their different ideas on the Eucharist. Against this many of the stanch old Lutherans rebelled, and, rather than submit, hundreds, headed by their pastors, emigrated to America, where they fondly hoped to find pure Lutheran doctrine and discipline. To their dismay, they found that their co-religionists in America had departed further from the standards than the most liberal in Prussia. One of the self-exiled pastors, the Rev. Maximilian Oertel, looked for comfort and consolation to a Church which professed the same doctrines as in the days of Luther, which had the same hierarchy, the same worship, the same sacraments. He became a Catholic with many of his flock, and his example influenced numbers of his school.

The war with Mexico, although in its outset it gave some petty bigots in the army an opportunity to molest and oppress Catholics in the service, brought several officers into the Church. Freemasonry and the scum of French revolution ideas had done much to weaken religion in Mexico; the old colleges of the Jesuits were gone; most of the seats of learning established by other orders had vanished; unworthy priests were thrust by state appointment into many benefices,—a Church, thus deprived of much of its instrumentality for good, with scandals growing apace, seemed unlikely to produce a favorable impression; yet officers were struck with the Church, even as they beheld it there; they were struck by the faith still maintained among the people, with what it had done for the Indians, and could still do for all, were it but free. This led many to reflect, to study, to pray. The army has many converts, General Rosecrans, Captains Deshon, Scammon, Haldiman, Ives; the navy, too, felt the same influence, and gave converts of the simple manly stamp of Commander Ward.

A conversion of this period is curious as showing ignorance in many Protestants, that may be regarded as invincible till Providence so disposes events that truth is at last presented to them. Colonel Dodge, of Pompey, a gentleman of means and position, who had represented his district in the Assembly of New York, one day towards nightfall saw a peddler's wagon give way in the difficult road near his house. He went to his aid, but, finding that the damage could not be repaired till morning, offered the man

hospitality for the night. After putting up his horse, the peddler thankfully entered the kitchen, but disclosed by the ruddy light of fire and lamp an unmistakably pleasant Irish face. Alarm took possession of Mrs. Dodge. This man was, undoubtedly, a Catholic, and they might expect to be robbed or murdered before the sun rose. Her husband did not allow fear to inflame his imagination so wildly, but he was ill at ease. Adroit questioning drew a confession of faith, but the honest man, while avowing himself a sincere Catholic, declared himself not well enough read to explain all the doctrines of his Church, or show how well founded they were. He slept soundly that night, though his entertainers scarcely closed their eyes; their guest a virtual prisoner within well-locked doors.

When, next morning, the peddler's wagon was repaired, he wished to make some return to his host and hostess. He could not well offer money, but he opened his stores, and pressed them to accept some token of his gratitude; a book, containing an exposition of Catholic doctrine, was all that Mr. Dodge would accept. After the peddler's departure, he began from curiosity to read it, and soon proceeded to verify the scriptural references. As he read on, and the whole scheme of Catholic doctrine came before him, he was amazed. This was clear, reasonable, scriptural He read aloud to his wife, who, after some misgivings, admitted that it was the clearest exposition of religion she had ever heard. By the time the peddler travelled back past their house, the little book was thoroughly mastered, or rather it had thoroughly mastered them. They purchased other Catholic books from him, and then ordered some from New York, thus, without guidance, making their way to the truth. They had never seen a Catholic priest or a Catholic church, and there was not one within twenty miles of their place. They laid before their old minister and others in the neighborhood their doubts about Protestantism, and what seemed to them sound in Catholic teaching. As may be supposed, the answers dealt more in denunciations of the Pope and the Catholic religion than in any strong argument to show that the Protestant doctrine, worship and ministry had any such divine authority as to require any man to accept them. The Dodges always returned home from these conferences more shaken in their Protestantism, and more convinced that, if there was any Church established by Christ, it was the Catholic Church, and it alone. Mr. Dodge soon began to explain his views to his neighbors, and ceased to attend the Presbyterian church, where he was a deacon. He and his wife were at last arraigned before that church for heresy! To her own astonishment, Mrs. Dodge there made an open avowal of her faith in all that the Catholic Church teaches. Preparing for the coming feast of Christmas, they drove to the nearest Catholic

church. There, to their great joy, they were received, and celebrated the nativity of our Lord by receiving Him in the Blessed Sacrament.

Mr. Dodge's house soon became a station, where mass was said for a little congregation of converts, which had thus wonderfully sprung up.

Calvinism in Massachusetts while retaining the form, and to some extent, the name of Congregationalism, had gradually thrown aside Christian truths till it had become Unitarianism or Transcendentalism. It seemed least likely to give new children to the Church. Yet there was in it an element that tended in the right direction. While Protestantism suppressed in a manner the humanity of our Lord, and regarded Him simply as God, Unitarianism, regarding Him as man, entered more into his human life. To them the tender relation of the Mother and the Son, the Catholic appeal to His Sacred Heart, and all the feeling of hope and confidence that His Human Nature inspires in us, were natural and intelligible. They could not study His Human Nature, without coming into harmony with Catholic feelings.

The strong minds broke away from Congregationalism as they found it insufficient to satisfy men's wants. Historically, logically, metaphysically, Protestantism had no claim which a reasonable man could acknowledge. But where was he to seek the absolute, the true, the real? Every system was tried, and every system said: I am but human; what you need is the Divine. One of the ablest thinkers of the day, Orestes A. Brownson, had, in his Boston *Quarterly Review*, and subsequently in a Review bearing his own name, been working steadily towards a firm standing-ground, till at last, at the close of the year 1844, he announced in the number of his Review for October that he accepted the Catholic Church as the only guide for man. The proud intellect, the man of learning and authority, bowed with all the submission of a child to the teachings of the Church.

A great movement took place in the Church of England soon after the granting of Catholic Emancipation. It was due remotely to the exiled French clergymen at the beginning of the century, who, in their intercourse with studious Anglican ministers, had given correct ideas of Catholic worship, devotions and prayers. These ideas first appeared in Dr. Lloyd's *Lectures on the Book of Common Prayer*. A new school arose, comprising Newman, Pusey, Keble, Froude, Wilberforce. The study of the Fathers, of the Roman and Oriental liturgies, of the lives of English saints, all created the desire to bring England back to the old faith. They hoped indeed to revive the past, without actually submitting to Rome. A series of tracts was issued at Oxford advocating a return. The same views were upheld in the *British Critic*, in New-

man's *Church of the Fathers*, in the *Lives of the English Saints*. But the writers remained in the Anglican Church, seeking in study, prayer and austerities to lead England back. Richard Hurrell Froude, the first leader, died, but they remained outside the fold, though prayers and devotions were offered up by Catholics to obtain for them light and strength. Towards the close of the year 1845, John Henry Newman, who had become the leader of the movement, convinced that only by personal union with the centre of unity can aught be effected, gave up all worldly prospects, his cherished hopes, his personal feelings, and asked to be received into the Roman Catholic Church as an humble catechumen. This hesitation of years had prepared hundreds for the same step. Never since the great apostasy had so many men of education, ability, zeal and spotless life, at once sought to be reconciled with the See of Peter. The movement was not confined to England. In the United States the writings of the Oxford school had been read and studied widely. Their principles had found adherents among bishops and clergy, but they were as violently opposed by the Calvinistic or Low Church party. The proposed ordination of Carey, an avowed Tractarian, brought the matter to a crisis. A host of brilliant and zealous men followed Newman's example as they had his doctrines. Bishop Ives, of North Carolina, with a host of Episcopal clergymen and students, became Catholics, not in a body but gradually, as each yielded to grace. As in all movements, some were carried on who had not examined deeply or prayed earnestly, some who came half-hearted and who failed to persevere; but, though a few relapsed, the great majority became earnest and zealous laborers in the true Church, many became priests, others by their pen enriched the literature of Catholicity or became its champions. The influence of the Oxford movement continued for years and was fruitful in conversions. Revs. I. T. Hecker, Hewit, McLeod, Homer, Wheaton, Preston, Whitcher, Huntington, and a host of other converts, with men like James A. McMaster, were the fruit of this movement.

At a subsequent period the invitation addressed by Pope Pius IX. to the adherents of Protestantism found a response in the learned Rev. Mr. Stone, who in his *Invitation Heeded* showed his reasons for embracing the faith as a response to that charitable call of the Father of the Faithful, reasons which gave many the courage to follow his example.

The Episcopal Church, however, was not the only one in which a school arose exciting in many souls wants and desires, that unity with the centre of unity could alone satisfy. In the Reformed Church John Williamson Nevin saw how steadily Protestantism was drifting away from all that was essentially Christian. He endeavored to recall the Reformed Church from its naturalism,

although he did not dare to avow a belief in the supernatural. He maintained an apostolic succession to be vital, that sacraments were channels of grace, and sin really forgiven in baptism; while in the Eucharist he held to a real presence. These ideas advocated with learning or ability in the Mercersburg *Review* became known as the Mercersburg system. It found advocates and warm assailants. Many trained in this school found that there was no alternative between Pantheism and Catholicity, and that there was no escape from the necessity of embracing the Catholic doctrines fully. Among these was one of the ablest contributors to the *Review*, Mr. Wolff, who embraced the Catholic faith, and though at first shunned and isolated, succeeded in inducing many of the circle in which he had moved not only to see the reasonableness and necessity of the step he had taken, but even to surrender all their early prejudices and follow his example. He has for many years edited with ability and judgment the *Catholic Standard* of Philadelphia; to the readers of this REVIEW he is too well known to need further allusion.

The conversions, which have gone steadily on from the earliest days of the settlement of the country, embrace many whom we have not included here, men of position like Governor Burnett and Dr. McLoughlin, of Oregon; Lemuel Sawyer, member of Congress; Baine, Professor Haldiman, Hunt, Newton, James A. Williams, Major Strobel, Drs. Green and Emmet.

Nor should the other sex be forgotten. Mrs. Peters, of Cincinnati, Mrs. Dorsey, Miss Fisher, of North Carolina, Miss Hemenway, Mrs. General Meagher, the Barlow sisters, Miss Edes, Mrs. Ellet, Mrs. White, Mrs. Laura Keene, Mrs. Connolly, Miss Scott, daughter of General Scott, are but a few of the noble army of women who have bravely responded to the grace calling them to the faith.

We can, indeed, give but a few typical cases of the conversions which in our day and country have consoled the Church. As will be seen, the convert in almost every case seeks the priest, not the priest the convert. The priest as a rule is overworked in this country, with the discharge of duties pressing daily on him. He comes into rare contact with those who do not belong to his faith, and cannot attempt to influence their minds. When a person comes to him in doubt, he can advise, and, as the cases we cite show, persons often come to a priest not only convinced, but self-taught in the doctrines of the Church.

Let us now consider the position of these neo-Catholics after their conversion and the influence they have exercised.

While the penal laws were in vigor, and profession of Catholic faith entailed loss of citizenship, fines, double taxes and other hardships, it was an heroic act for any man to take his stand among the

oppressed and condemned followers of Christ. Even after the laws had been to a great extent abolished by the force of events, it was an immense sacrifice to become a Catholic. On the body to which they passed their influence was great. Catholics, from their long bondage, were timid, reticent, sensitive to ridicule, while the convert who had not been thus "trained in shackles," but who had been wont to speak his mind fully and freely, and who felt a natural pride in being right, did much to give the Catholic body some of his own courage and outspoken frankness. He was often carried too far, and evoked bitterness and malice, but he did much to rouse his fellow-believers from the almost servile attitude which had become habitual to the Catholic body. From an early period in this century the Catholic body in many parts consisted of immigrants from Ireland, and it was swelled by successive tides of new comers. The mass of the Catholic population here thus associated their faith with a foreign nationality. The descendants of the original Catholic body, and even the descendants of the earlier periods of immigration born in this country, timid from long oppression, and not self-asserting, soon found themselves put aside by the new comers and looked upon with a kind of suspicion for not entering into feelings which, from their American birth and education they could not share, and which really had no relation to Catholic doctrine, practice, or thought. They found themselves regarded by their fellow-countrymen, on the other hand, as belonging to a foreign and un-American church, and before many years the charge was directly formulated that to be a Catholic was to belong to a foreign church, connection with which was incompatible with loyalty to American principles. If this position was difficult for Catholics born and reared here, who, however, had some family tradition from their immediate progenitors, and could understand the feeling if they could not share it, this same position became a severe trial to the American convert. In the eyes of his Protestant brethren he was a kind of traitor, false to his country and its constitution, and as such shunned. He found himself thrown in with a class in whom religious were intimately interwoven with political ideas, and who looked with jealousy at any evidence of want of interest in the latter. It was doubtless due to the working of this element that many of the early converts, Kewley, Richards, Holmes, Thayer, Burroughs, Blyth, Allen, Cooper, went to Canada or to Europe to find more harmonious surroundings. Those who bravely lived their life here found themselves isolated, often painfully so. Cut off from the old circles in which they had moved, they learned how difficult it was to form new associations among the adherents of their adopted faith. There were comparatively very few to give them the hand of fellowship, there being nothing in our Catholic churches like the

membership in Protestant bodies, and none to welcome newcomers. Where the converts buoyed up by strong faith persevered, their children in many cases were less courageous, and the family lapsed back into Protestantism.

When, at a later period, the German immigration assumed such immense proportions, a body of German Catholics grew up, and here came, in addition, another national feeling, with a foreign language, different modes of thought, different religious practices. A Catholic, in a part where this element predominated, found himself lost, unless he acquired the language and identified himself with the hopes and desires of Germans. Even now, one finds in German Catholic papers the most contemptuous allusions to American and Irish Catholics.

To foster these national feelings unduly is a great mistake. They breed animosity; and as the rising generation will be American in feelings, they must look upon this as their country, and if their religion is a matter of nationality, it will expire with it. The children of the present generation will be treated by the body of immigrants, in their day, as Americans, whether converts or Catholics by origin, are now treated, and many will fall away, as, in fact, many are daily falling away without an effort being made to save them. It is really a canker eating away the life of the Church in the United States.

Those who labor mainly among Catholics of foreign birth, as well as such Catholics themselves, rarely form a conception of the extent to which we Catholics, as a body, are regarded by the people of this country only as a sort of foreign camp in their midst, who will in time scatter and be lost in the mass of the Protestant, or at least non-Catholic population. Though the census will show that the Catholic far exceeds the foreign population, only part of which is Catholic, it is not easy to convince or disabuse them. Many things which they see and know keep up the delusion. A Protestant will point to the map and say: "Where are your American Catholics? The whole country is laid off in dioceses, as though you owned it, but how is it that your Popes have never found an American Catholic fit to occupy a see west of the Mississippi and Lake St. Clair? There are thousands of miles where no American-born bishop has ever been seen."

Better, perhaps, than any others the converts know and appreciate the feeling of the non-Catholic public towards us, their efforts to entangle our weaker brethren, their own uncertainties as to faith, their doubts and delusions. It is a trite saying which ascribes intemperate zeal to converts; for men who have undergone great mental trials, whose consideration of a topic has been absorbing, cannot treat of it languidly. A man who has gone through this course must be energetic, and where he knows thoroughly those whom he addresses, he not unfrequently cuts deeply and merci-

lessly, believing that it is a case where the surgeon, to effect a cure, should use his instruments boldly. The early convert, the Rev. Mr. Thayer, in this way provoked controversies which created hostility instead of stimulating calm and prayerful inquiry. He effected little here, comparatively. In the midst of a thoroughly Catholic population in Ireland, he effected wonders by his ministry. Of late years there has been less controversy; and even our Catholic press, beyond occasional ebullitions, shows little temper or acrimony.

Converts who have entered the priesthood have given some of the best and most zealous missionaries. That so many have been selected and recommended by bishops in different provinces for vacant sees, and appointed by the Holy See to the episcopate, proves the esteem in which their learning, ability, and exemplary life were held. Archbishops Whitfield, Eccleston, Bayley, of Baltimore; Wood, of Philadelphia; Bishops Young, Tyler, Rosecrans, Wadhams, Gilmour, attest this. Among the clergy are the Congregation of the Paulists, founded by the Very Rev. I. T. Hecker, almost all converts, who, by their missions and their contributions to Catholic literature in various forms, have rendered essential service to the cause of truth. The Very Rev. C. I. Carter, Rt. Rev. Thomas S. Preston, Rt. Rev. George H. Doane, the Dominican Fathers Ffrench and Hill; Father Stone, and other Passionists; Rev. Dr. Neligan, and many others, might be named, as priests who, in the exercise of the ministry, or in important positions, or by their pens, have done much to establish discipline, and make religion known and respected among those who are strangers to Catholic truth. The converts in the priesthood are generally exemplary men, to whom the faithful accord all confidence, and who receive many converts into the Church, their own experience enabling them to understand and remove difficulties that beset the sincere inquirer.

That those who remain among the laity have exerted a wide influence is unquestioned. Dr. Brownson gave his *Review* to the Catholic cause. His earlier volumes show the progress of his mind, and his gradual familiarity with Catholic thought, that make them a study. Once firmly grounded, his philosophical essays were read and pondered among Protestants as no Catholic writings from the press of this country had ever been. For many years the numbers were regularly reprinted in England, exerting no little influence. His long acquaintance with the best American thinkers, and the drift of ideas that prevailed outside the Church, enabled him to bring his arguments home to their conviction. His hopes, at first, of the possibility of extensive conversions were great, and though in time he saw that conversions were slow, and comparatively individual acts, he grew only the more earnest. Few

ventured to cope with him in argument, and the moral influence of his *Review* was such as no other Catholic writings had ever possessed. That it counteracted much error, and carried Catholic truth into quarters where it had never before reached, is unquestioned. Its influence is still felt, and the fact that a reprint of the most important articles is called for, shows that the essays still meet wants, and can effect good among a new generation of Americans.

As editors of our Catholic papers, many converts have rendered signal service. Foremost of all is James Augustine McMaster, whose name has for years been identified with the *Freeman's Journal*, of New York, a paper regarded perhaps with greater respect than any other by Protestants, as an exponent of Catholic thought.

Beckwith, Huntington, Wolff, Oertel and other converts also have, in the editorial chair, rendered good service. In the field of general literature, Dr. Ives did much, not only in his part of Maitland's *Dark Ages*, but in essays; Huntington, McLeod, Christian Reid, have elevated the literary standard of Catholic works, but we cannot claim any to compare with Newman, Faber, or Adelaide Procter.

The community founded by Mrs. Connolly, and which contains many, like her, converts to the faith, has, though it has acquired little extension in this country, exercised a most decided influence by the thoroughness of its system of education, full of sound practical sense and solidity. It is the very reverse of the superficial, and aims to ground the pupils thoroughly in literature, art, and a knowledge of religion, its doctrines, history, and worship, as well as in all the graces of true womanhood.

The influence of a woman like the late Mrs. Peters it would be hard to measure. She was foremost in so many good works, projected and carried out so many that seemed hopeless, was so untiring, without presumption, humble, devoted, and faithful, that her influence was remarkable. Nor is she alone. In various parts of the country women, in and out of the cloister, in all walks of life, who have learned the beauty of Catholic truth, are exerting an influence that is not recorded, but that Catholics in every city and town will recognize and admit.

Still the position of the convert is often attended by great trials. A Protestant clergyman becoming a Catholic gives up a livelihood, and by his training and former life is unfitted for secular life; if married, he cannot ordinarily become a priest, and there is no avenue open to him. We have no college professorships to bestow, no associations for mission or benevolent work, giving offices which such gentlemen could fill, as almost all such work with us is effected through religious communities. It was once proposed to form a body of catechists, or inferior clergy, in order to employ

such converts and make their abilities effective. There is a want which we have already indicated of associations, perhaps on the plan of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, in which the main object would be to look after young men, and by the power of example keep them within the fold, obtain occasionally employment for them, where necessary, withdraw them from dangerous positions. The Catholic Union seemed at one time destined to occupy this field. The Council still exists, and labors to effect reforms, but the particular Unions, which the Council was supposed to represent, exist apparently only in name in most cities. This is the case in New York, with the exception of the Xavier Union, which has attained a solid and permanent condition, and is the instrumentality of great good. But meanwhile the young men are slipping away, and converts familiar with the working of organizations like the Young Men's Christian Associations, and aware of their defects, might be in many cases most serviceable in what might be called Catholic home mission work. The parochial clergy, with the work before them, cannot undertake this, and unemployed priests, whom our right reverend bishops might assign to such undertakings, are few. It does seem as if it were a field where experienced converts, and other laymen, might become potent auxiliaries, and thus men, whose services are now lost, might become of the utmost service in saving young men who for want of moral support and social help are shamed into neglecting their religious duties, and make shipwreck of the faith.

The question of a great Catholic university has been raised, but colleges and universities cannot thrive unless the preparatory schools exist in greater number. In our large cities, while there are many academies or high schools for girls, there are comparatively few for boys. Baltimore seems to have but one with 100 pupils; Boston one with 220 pupils; New York four with about 1000 pupils; Philadelphia two with about 400 pupils. Evidently these figures do not approach the number of youth, sons of Catholic parents able to give them an education superior to that afforded by the parochial or the public school. To what institutions are the rest of the Catholic boys sent? There seems to be in many parents a disinclination to send their sons to schools conducted by religious; and, on the other hand, there is a disinclination to establish secular schools with simply a clergyman as president and a spiritual director. Such institutions with salaried professors necessarily entail expense, but if they can be made effective and will draw pupils, who are not now sent to Catholic schools, and whose salvation is at stake, great sacrifices ought to be made to maintain them. The experiment in some of the large cities would not involve much risk, if prudently managed, and such an institution, if it met the public want, would soon find endowment. It is not

easy to believe that, while Protestants are constantly giving liberal donations and bequests to institutions of learning, wealthy Catholics are utterly indifferent. They cannot be so different from their Protestant neighbors that they cannot be interested in education. The subject is one beyond the limits of this paper, and it is introduced merely as noting a field in which converts of education and experience as teachers may be employed to advantage.

THE ALLEGED FALL OF POPE LIBERIUS.

De Hebræorum et Christianorum sacra monarchia et de infallibili in utraque magisterio. Per Professorem Aloisium Vincenzi. Romæ ex typographia Vaticana, 1875.

Erreurs et mensonges historiques. Par M. Ch. Barthélemy. Paris. Bleriot ed., 1875.

AMONG the many great historical puzzles that have engaged the attention or stimulated the diligence of the learned for centuries, that furnished by the alleged fall of the saintly Liberius stands forth prominent, almost unique. Two schools of thought have been occupied at intervals during fifteen centuries in the vain task of unravelling the threads of this provokingly entangled snare; the one to vindicate the name of a Pope whose memory has been embalmed in the eloquence of St. Ambrose, and the other to brand it with deepest infamy, to bury it beneath a mountain of malignant opprobrium. To the latter school belonged many historians, or dabblers in ancient story, of the last of the seventeenth century. For those who took their creed and inspiration from the modern Mahomet, Martin Luther, it was a labor of love to justify the rebellion of their master against what they called the dynastic despotism, which had lain like a terrible nightmare on the slumbering breast of Christendom for over a thousand years. What cared they if, in rejecting the Papacy, they would infect the religion and the order established by the man-God? They argued then that the Papacy was fallen from grace, and this as early as the fourth century. Look, say they, at Liberius! He subscribed an Arian formula, or creed, and in his delirious haste to regain his darling Roman See, delivered Christendom over to the sect which railed at the divinity of Jesus Christ! If, then, the Roman See,

the centre of your boasted unity, became heretic as early as the fourth century, what corruption may we not look for in more recent times?

When, through political intrigue and bad faith, the party of the "Gallican liberties" appeared in France, at its head were found some men who, like Bossuet, shone like stars of the first magnitude in the literary as well as in the ecclesiastical firmament; men who, by virtue of their own principles, were urged, perhaps unwillingly, into an attitude hostile to the indefectibility of the Holy See. In his "Defensio," as we shall see further on, the eminent Bossuet, who undoubtedly had read all that appeared in evidence for and against Liberius at his day, was betrayed into arguments and forced to conclusions from which, it is certain, his noble faith recoiled. What wonder, then, that lesser lights were bedimmed, or that scholars without the Church's pale would with impunity point their shafts against the memory of the calumniated Pontiff? But, alas for human words and human works, modern criticism has inserted a wedge into the knotty trunk of Arian forgery, and the sundered parts reveal to astonished eyes the "true inwardness" of the forgers. In this article it will be convenient, 1st. To sketch, *currente calamo*, the history of the times in which Liberius lived and suffered. 2d. To present the main arguments used to prove his fall; and 3d. To refute these arguments, and thereby establish his innocence. It was during the reign of Constantine that Arius, a man of stately figure and apparently ascetic habits, began to preach to the people of Alexandria that the Saviour who had redeemed them was not, as the Christian world believed, really and substantially the Son of God. The novelty of the doctrine, the eloquence of the preacher, and the disaffection of a certain number of courtiers, gave the error an impulse which not even its inventors had foreseen or expected. In vain did the patriarch, St. Alexander, endeavor to recall the ambitious and erring priest. The very patriarchal throne whence issued the fatherly invitations to retract his blasphemy was the prize coveted by the heresiarch, and the disappointment occasioned by his failure to secure it drove him to the sacrifice of his faith and his salvation. Mildness and entreaty failing, the Patriarch convened a council to pronounce upon the errors of Arius. The heresiarch refused to retract them, and was excommunicated. The secretary of the Patriarch at this council was a young deacon, famous for his prudence, piety, and learning; and for him Arius conceived a particular hatred, which he seems to have transmitted to his children in heresy. The deacon was *Athanasius*, in whose defence our Liberius suffered so much, forty years afterwards. Retiring into Palestine, Arius won golden opinions among the Emperor's wretched courtiers, among whom were Eusebius, a bishop in

name only, and Constantia, the Emperor's sister. Many other Eastern bishops also supported the cause of Arius. He composed verses in which he embodied the poison of his doctrines, and distributed them among the common people. Set to the airs of the obscene songs of the day, they "took," as we say nowadays, and in a few months the blasphemies of an excommunicated renegade became the faith of thousands. Nor need we be astonished at this rapid popular lapse into heresy. Only a few years had elapsed since Constantine, victorious over Maxentius and Licinius, became sole master of the Roman commonwealth and put an end to the persecutions. For three centuries, in fact, the wave of persecution had swelled high, and, therefore, religious instruction was given to the Catholic masses under very great difficulty and amid constant dangers. Even many of the clergy had not the science their state required. Since the conversion of Constantine, though no edicts were pressed against the pagans, yet these felt that favors would be best obtained by believing or affecting to believe as the Emperor. Doubtless, then, of the vast numbers who joined the Christian Church at this period, many were prompted by interest, others were allured by fashion, and comparatively few were urged by conviction. Instruction in the necessary articles of faith was all that could be dispensed—and these but superficially—at such a time; but the Christian spirit very, very few seemed to have grasped, even in a low degree. It is a miracle in the moral order that any Christianity was left at all when the persecutions temporarily ended; and if, with Gibbon and the so-called philosophic school, we reject the vision of the cross seen by Constantine in the heavens, it seems somewhat more than a prodigy that he and so many others exchanged the religion of their glorious ancestors, for that of an ignoble and crucified "Galilean." But to return to our subject. For five long years the doctrinal war continued, the athletes on both sides deploying their utmost abilities, exerting every influence that could be brought to bear upon their adversaries, and exhausting the ammunition of the Greek tongue in subtleties and distinctions, which that elegant language, of all others, is capable of expressing. Constantine is interviewed by the friends of Arius, he is besieged by the tears and entreaties of his sister, and fawned upon by unworthy ecclesiastics. Finally, with the concurrence of Pope Sylvester and some others, he assembles the famous Council of Nice. Three hundred and eighteen bishops there assembled proclaimed the ancient belief to be a dogma of faith. Jesus is the λογος, the Eternal Word of God, uncreated and (δμουδσιος) consubstantial with the Father. Whether we ascribe it to pure malice, or to ignorance of the binding force of a solemn decree made by the Church in council, or in fine to a hope that the fallen might return to the fold, certain is it that many of the Eastern

bishops communicated *in divinis* with the now *formal* heretics just as they had done previously. Whatever the cause, many prevaricated, and neither the threats of the Emperor nor the voice of conscience brought back to a full acquiescence in the decrees of Nice a large portion of the clergy and people of the East. For more than thirty years from this time until the reign of Julian, the Christian world presents a scene of wild confusion led by the Arian emperors, the sons and successors of Constantine. Athanasius is several times driven from his see of Alexandria, in which he succeeded St. Alexander; now on the charge of murder, sacrilege, and other nameless crimes, now on the charge of stopping the supplies of wheat—and every student of history knows how serious such a charge must appear, since Egypt was the great granary of the Roman world. Driven away at one time by the imperial troops, at another he is rescued by them from the murderous frenzy of the Arian bishops and their creatures. Council after council is summoned and disbanded with no end other than to gratify the whim of an imperial theologue, or the spleen of a usurping ecclesiastic. Creed follows fast upon creed, and one scarcely overtakes and devours its predecessor, when itself is overtaken and devoured by a new one. In all some fifty creeds, Arian, semi-Arian, and nondescript, welled up from the copious fountain of heretical impiety, and the people looked in vain out into the doctrinal mist for a gleam of hopeful light, and groped about for something solid in the ever-darkening clouds of heterodoxy which enveloped them and their teachers. The fickle Constantine banished Arius and recalled him, silenced Alexander, then gave him a hearing, expelled Athanasius and restored him, sat in silence and awe before the assembled Fathers at Nice, and yet, probably delaying his baptism till, at death's portal, he received it at the hands of Eusebius, whose faith was as uncertain as his conduct was blameworthy. Constantius, the son of Constantine, was an avowed Arian and a coward besides, and every coward is cruel when he has power. In the battle of Mursa 54,000 of Rome's best soldiers fell victims of his ambition, and while the Cæsar Julian kept in check the barbarians of the North, this emperor took all the credit to himself. Instead of attending to the decaying finances, or winning fame by checking the anti-Christian persecution of Sapor, the Persian, and guarding the outposts of the empire against invasion, this theologaster squandered his time in disputations with the divines of his party, and in persecuting those of his subjects who dared to believe otherwise than their whimsical master.

The See of Rome, however, remained unshaken amid these stormy scenes. In a surging and angry ocean strewn with the wrecks of many creeds and philosophies, flashed one beacon light which never ceased for an instant to mark the harbor of infallible

doctrine; it came from "the house built on the rock." To Peter's successor, where his brethren so often betrayed him, the persecuted but ever active Athanasius turned his face; for even in this early age the East acknowledged in the Pope a primacy over all other bishops—awkward as the fact is for the sects. Julius I., then in the chair, indicted a council to examine the cause of the struggling bishop; he justifies him and condemns as irregular the proceedings of those who drove him from his see. Ursacius and Valens, two unworthy bishops, who, instead of residing in their own sees, followed continually at the heels of the Emperor, were among the deadly enemies of Athanasius, and they sought every opportunity to vilify him before their royal patron, little listing Papal decisions. Their repeated and calumnious charges, supported by specious forgeries, enraged the Emperor to an extent that perhaps extenuates the malice of his subsequent acts of violence, while the real instigators of his crimes have become objects of contempt to every succeeding age. On a charge that Athanasius was a supporter of the usurper Magnentius, these creatures urged the Emperor to annul his former letters of reconciliation with the Patriarch, and to solicit his condemnation by Liberius, who had succeeded Julius in the Roman See. Constantius understood well the importance and even the necessity of such a sentence—it would have ended the controversy forthwith—and he determined to obtain it by blandishments or by threats. It was in the first year of the Pontificate of Liberius (352) that the demand was made. To the son of Constantine was due some respect; and to this, rather than to any suspicion of the guilt of the accused, it may be owing that the persecuted bishop was again put on trial. A council meets at Rome; on one side are the unsupported charges of the Emperor; on the other the letters of the Egyptian bishops, together with the acts of their council testifying to the innocence of their Patriarch. Only one verdict was, under the circumstances, possible; and by the chair of truth that verdict was rendered. The faith of Athanasius was that of the Church; his sufferings for that faith had made him a confessor, almost a martyr, whose acquittal by the Pope was hailed with acclamations of joy by the Catholic world, while it stung like a barbed arrow the imperial accuser, and maddened him beyond control. He decreed exile against all who would not subscribe to the condemnation of Athanasius. The Pope sent two legates to him, Vincent of Capua and the veteran Osius, with the hope of appeasing his wrath, and solicited him to convene a general synod. While the legates were on their mission, Vincent was inveigled, by some Arian bishops into a condemnation of Athanasius—a fact which the Pope deplores in a letter to Osius. Another embassy of three bishops

waited on Constantius and presented a letter from Liberius, in which he expressed great grief in view of the Emperor's injustice, disclaimed any desire to increase the prerogatives of his see, but maintained the inviolability of those already possessed by it; he declared that he was resolved to guard the faith of his predecessors, and once more asked him to convene a council to settle their interminable disputes. Constantius agrees and names Milan as the place for the meeting of the council, to which the Pope sends his legates, Lucifer of Cagliari, Pancratius, a priest, and Hilary, then a deacon. The synod opened under unfavorable auspices, the Emperor in person being there. From the outset violence reigned supreme, and the spirit of party triumphed where the spirit of peace should rule.

The Arian faction, with the state to support it, insulted and banished the Papal legates, and scourged one of them, Hilary, the most outspoken against the irregular proceedings. The other bishops present at the council, overawed by civil and military violence, signed the condemnation of Athanasius. Liberius sent to his glorious legates, now in exile, letters of condolence and encouragement, wherein he regrets his inability to suffer with them. Now a fresh difficulty arose for the Arian party. Though the condemnation of Athanasius was signed by many bishops, and the Papal legates were disposed of, yet Liberius was unconquered. How approach him? Eusebius, one of the eunuchs, a class, by the way, which was transplanted from the East at the decline of Roman greatness, was commissioned with the task. He approached the Pontiff with bribes, and was repulsed; and the bribe-money, which he placed as a gift on the tomb of the Apostles, was thrown into the street by the Pope's order. Threats were equally vain. "Let the Emperor," said the Pope, "replace Athanasius in his see and revoke his cruel edicts, and then we shall call a council, away from court influence; we will first anathematize Arianism, and then inquire into the charges against Athanasius." The Emperor then ordered the Pope to be brought to Milan, where, after a fruitless interview, he exiled him into Thrace. Such are in the main the circumstances which led to the alleged fall of Liberius; such is a glimpse of the troublous period of about a quarter of century. On inquiry we find the masses ignorant, many of the clergy little better than intruders, intriguers, and courtiers, who put their livings above their faith. We hear of wars in the North and East, of seditions in every city, often excited by factious bishops and their asseclæ, of exorbitant taxation and dishonest officials, of calumnies made and retracted, and then repeated, of forged documents and letters unscrupulously circulated. We find one Emperor a Pontifex Maximus while professing Christianity, and another an Arian and

a quack theologian. Add to this that the means of rapid communication, so familiar to us of the XIXth century, were then unknown, and we have the outlines of the IVth century.

II. We now come to the arguments used by those who regard Liberius as a heretic. The narrative given above of the part played by this Pope in the Athanasian difficulty is disputed by no one, so far as we know. When the eunuch Eusebius failed to extort by threats as well as by bribes the signature of the Pontiff in condemnation of the Alexandrian bishop, he retired to his imperial master at Milan. We have seen above how the Pope was sent for, interviewed and exiled to Beræa, in Thrace. After two years passed in misery he was permitted to return to Rome, where he ended his days peaceably. How, it is asked, did he obtain leave to return? An Emperor would certainly never yield to a bishop; and it is, therefore, obvious that the Pope yielded at length to the pressure put upon him, subscribed the condemnation, and in one word abjured the faith of Nice. Furthermore, he adopted as his own the creed of Sirmium, and thereby became formally an Arian. This is the substance of the charge. We shall proceed to quote from a few of the chief authors who make the charge, this being the fairest way to present our opponents' case. Gibbon, a historian of the skeptical school, and one who betrays peculiar fondness for Protestant historians, always preferring their opinions to those of Catholics when the honor of Rome is involved, expresses his opinion concerning the Liberius question in these few words: "When he was banished to Beræa, in Thrace, he sent back a large sum which had been offered for the accommodation of his journey, and *insulted* the court of Milan by the haughty remark that the Emperor and his eunuchs might want that gold to pay their soldiers and their bishops. The resolution of Liberius and Osius was at length subdued by the hardships of exile and confinement. The Roman Pontiff *purchased his return by some criminal compliances*, and afterwards expiated his guilt by a seasonable repentance." (Italics ours.) Decline and Fall, vol. ii., p. 345. Milman's. Such is the view taken by Protestants and infidels generally, and certainly it is jauntily enough expressed by the author quoted, who is esteemed by many the greatest and most lucid of modern historians.[1] As Bossuet, the author of the charming treatise or discourse on universal history, is so well known, and his opinions on controverted points of great weight, his presentation of the case against Liberius will probably appear the strongest exposition of adverse opinion we

[1] We may remark here, by the way, that Gibbon must have had in his mind the fictitious history of Pope Marcellinus and his repentance after his fall, with all the poetic accompaniments of tears and a council of edified clerics! For there is nowhere on record a "seasonable repentance," nor anything approaching it, in the career of Liberius.

can choose. It is not necessary here to give all the circumstances which brought out the famous "Defensio;" let it suffice to say, that when in A.D. 1682 the clergy of France ventured to assert their spiritual independence of Rome, Bossuet was chosen to draw up an exposition and a defence of their principles and position, and one of the grounds of the argument was, that the Roman See was not what it professed to be, infallible in matters of doctrinal teaching. After mentioning the repugnance he experiences in undertaking this work, he continues: "For my part I lean to the opinion that, of all these various formulas (the Arian or semi-Arian creeds of Sirmium), that which Liberius subscribed was the most innocent. But it is no less certain that Liberius acted very badly, since, knowing the artifices and the treachery of the Arians, he subscribed a profession of faith which dissembled the consubstantiality of Christ. . . . . After this subscription Liberius did not hesitate, in letters as shameful as miserable, to take sides with the Arians and to banish Athanasius from his communion and from that of the Roman Church. But at this epoch, the communion of Athanasius was the Catholic communion. The conduct of Liberius justifies fully the anathema with which St. Hilary branded the memory of this Pope. St. Jerome says formally that Liberius subscribed an heretical formula. On his return, therefore, the Romans considered him only as a traitor who had deserted the cause of the faith, who had sullied himself with Arian filth, and who had communicated with the sectaries in everything except the question of second baptism. These are the very words of the Liber Pontificalis." Here is a terrible indictment, well presented, strongly supported, and if the authorities were but trustworthy, victoriously sustained. But the error lies in the evidence, not in Bossuet's logic. In his *Universal History*, he trips over this great historic problem in these few words: "The orthodox bishops were driven from their sees; the whole Church was filled with confusion and trouble; the constancy of Pope Liberius yields to the hardship of exile, and Osius, formerly the prop of the Church, is vanquished by suffering." The proofs for the double accusation of perfidy and apostasy the learned bishop finds in the *Fragments* of Hilary, in the words of Jerome, in the *acts* of Eusebius, and in the Liber Pontificalis. We shall dissect these authorities later on. Fleury, a historian of the rank Gallican school, who endeavors to pull down the reputation of the Popes wherever he meets them, after detailing the undisputed facts about the persecution of Liberius, says: "The bishop of Beræa when Liberius was in exile presented to him the Sirmium profession of faith, that is to say, according to the most probable opinion, the first proposed against Photinus at a council held in the year 351, at which Demophilus had assisted. It suppressed the terms

consubstantial and *like in substance*, but could otherwise be defended, as, in fact, it has been, by St. Hilary. Liberius approved of it and subscribed it as Catholic; he renounced the communion of Athanasius and embraced that of the Easterns, that is, of the Arians." Fleury here admits that the formula signed has an orthodox interpretation, but otherwise the tenor of his opinion is, that Liberius became a heretic, openly and scandalously. Perhaps the good Gaul did not see the patent contradiction in his words. Mosheim, the Lutheran historian, is at least no harder on the Pope than Fleury. He says in his church history: "The Emperor's (Constantius) attachment to the Arians animated him against their adversaries, whom he involved in various troubles and calamities, and obliged many of them by threats and punishment to come over to the sect which he esteemed and protected. Among these *forced* proselytes was Liberius, the Roman Pontiff, who was compelled to embrace Arianism, Anno 357." Respecting the original documents upon which these historians based their opinions, we may say that on their face they go strongly against Liberius, and it is only more modern and skilful criticism that has stripped them of their fictitious importance. The *Fragments* of Hilary, for instance, represent the Pope writing thus to the Eastern bishops: "To the most beloved priests and bishops of the East health. . . . . As the law says, 'justa judicate filii hominum,' I do not defend Athanasius, . . . but when I saw . . . that you had condemned him justly, I joined in your judgment and sent letters . . . to Constantius. Having removed Athanasius, therefore, from the communion of all of us, . . . I say that I am at peace and concord with you all and with the Oriental bishops."[1]

Further on, he says he accepts (libente animo suscepi) fully the Sirmian formula, etc. This is but a sample of the *Fragmenta*. Jerome says in his Chronicles: Liberius, overcome by the miseries of exile, subscribed the Arian heresy and entered Rome in triumph. The *Acta Eusebii* represent Liberius, after his return from exile, persecuting his former flock, publicly teaching Arianism, and joining with the Emperor to put the priest Eusebius to death. Even Bossuet dissents from the latter portion of this statement of the "Acts;" but altogether he regards them as good enough authority for his case, particularly as their contents agree strikingly with

[1] Here is the original quoted by Vincenzi, to whom we are greatly indebted for the materials of this article: "Dilectissimis fratribus presbyteris et episcopis orientalibus salutem . . . . sicut lex loquitur 'justa judicate filii hominum' ego Athanasium non defendo. . . . At ubi cognovi, quando Deo placuit juste vos illum condemnasse, mox consensum commodavi sententiis vestris, litterasque super nomine ejus . . . . dedi perferendas ad imperatorem Constantium. Itaque amoto Athanasio a communione omnium nostrum . . . . dico me cum omnibus vobis et cum universis orientalibus episcopis pacem et unanimitatem habere."

the words of the Liber Pontificalis. Here, it is said, is testimony sufficient, if history may at all be trusted, to establish the treason of Liberius against religion and justice. True, he was made to suffer, but he yielded, and there is the proof of the fact! Add to these the doubt of Rufinus about the innocence of Liberius, his bitter condemnation by his successor, Damasus, and the hard accusation of the outraged Athanasius in his history to the monks, and what more proof do we want that the unfortunate Pope ceased to confirm his brethren?

III. Having heard fully the case against Liberius, it is now in order to show its weakness; and this we shall do, 1st, by establishing the presumption of the Pope's innocence; 2d, by giving on historic authority the true explanation of his return to Rome; 3d, by showing the documents used by our opponents to be valueless. Liberius was of Roman birth and became Pope, A.D. 352, a stormy period in the Church's history, when anarchy was beginning to prevail in the government, and heresy to grow strong apace. From his youth up Liberius had manifested great piety, and his humility caused him to shun the highest office on earth and to resist his appointment. This resistance will, of course, be set down by those ninnies who measure all men by the rule of their own inclinations, as affected or "convenient;" but it is not in our power to scan and decipher men's intentions. His contemporaries, at least, thought his humility sincere. Up to the time of his reputed fall, his words, his letters, and all his acts were redolent of apostolic virtue; and after his restoration to his See, the same zeal to combat error, to denounce heresy, and to confirm his brethren by word and example, was ever manifest. In proof of this we may point to the tone of his letters regretting the fall of his legate Lucifer; his replies to the eunuch Eusebius; his rejection of the bribes offered him privately; his defiant tone to the Emperor himself; his refusal to take money for his journey from the Empress; his pathetic epistles to his legates in exile; his wish to suffer with them; his actual long-suffering in his cruel exile in Thrace. His expressed wish to suffer with the exiled bishops was, therefore, no bravado, but genuine, as the result proves. From these facts, which few deny, it is clear that the presumption of Liberius's innocence is very strong, so strong, in fact that to prove his fall demands evidence of the most positive and irreproachable kind. In his case we have not merely that legal presumption which shields the accused in every criminal case, "nemo præsumitur malus," but we have in his favor a chain of circumstances which preclude all probability of a fall. There are those who contend[1] that though Liberius signed an Arian

[1] Among them Natalis Alexander, vol. viii., 135, and in fact many Catholic writers and annalists, down to the last century. The fact that Liberius had signed a formula

formula, he did not become a heretic; for, they say, the formula he signed was really defensible, though it omits the "consubstantial." Now, granted for the moment that he did sign a formula, it is admitted that he signed it *under violent pressure* at the hands of imperial jailers; but such an act would be practically valueless. Secondly, the act, therefore, could not be interpreted to imply a wish to so teach the Church, in which case alone the Pope is declared infallible. Thirdly, since the creed said to have been *probably* signed by Liberius contained nothing positive against the faith, and only *omitted* an important word, even if intentionally, it would be interesting to know by what process of judicial interpretation his merely signing it could be called heretical *teaching*. Admitting, then, for argument's sake the fact of the signature of a Sirmian formula by Liberius, he cannot be said, as universal doctor of the Church, to have taught heresy. But we deny the fact of the signature absolutely. We are not called upon here to prove a negative; but as the alleged fact rests on the historic value of certain documents, we would have only to show that these documents are untrustworthy, in order to make clear the character of the accused. But we will not rest here. The presumption in favor of Liberius is strengthened by the favorable testimony of his contemporaries and immediate successors. We quote a few: St. Basil, in his Epistle 263, calls him "the most blessed bishop," and says that his faith and authority never failed. St. Ambrose, in the third book *de Virginibus*, calls him "beatæ memoriæ," of blessed memory—a term which he repeats frequently throughout the work. Pope Damasus, writing to the Illyrian bishops concerning the assent to be given the Nicene definition, says expressly that, though the council of Ariminum (Rimini) had decreed otherwise, "the Roman bishop Liberius, whose judgment must be sought before all others, gave no consent to its decrees." How could Damasus use this language, or enforce his own authority by the example of his predecessor, if there had been even a doubt of the latter's integrity? The inference is plain. Siricius, too, his second successor, cites the authority of Liberius adversely to re-baptism, and calls him "my predecessor of venerable memory." This is bitter irony if Liberius is not innocent. Athanasius, in his *Apologia*, thus relates the fall of Osius (or Hosius) of Cordova: (He signed the condemnation), "not because he thought us guilty, but because he was unable, by reason of his age and weakness, to bear his torture," No. 89. But there is not a word about the fall of Liberius, who was likewise in exile. Elsewhere he says that Liberius and Osius were witnesses who had preferred death to betrayal of the truth. If, however,

seemed to them established; but they took different views of the morality and significance of his act.

both these heroes fell, historic accuracy requires that the whole truth be told. In his work, *De fuga sua*, No. 4, Athanasius informs us that while the Church was in peace, and the congregation at prayers, many bishops, and among them Liberius, a *herald of the truth*, were torn away and driven into exile for no other cause than their opposition to Arianism; that, furthermore, they did not subscribe the calumnies which were uttered against him (Athanasius). This was written after the return of Liberius to Rome; but, if he had, as alleged, departed from the Nicene faith, of what use would his testimony be, or what weight would his name add to the cause of Athanasius? Would not the latter, on the contrary, have mentioned the unfortunate fall of the one who, *up to a certain time*, had defended him? And if he was, by the subscription of the Pope, cut off from the communion of Rome, would he not have mentioned the fact? This is no doubt the view taken by the forgers of the "history of Arianism" attributed to Athanasius, wherein the fall is related at length. It has been contended by some editors that the last numbers of the *Apologia* above mentioned are not authentic; but the learned Vincenzi maintains that the reason given by those editors in support of their opinion—viz., that the *Apologia* was completed *before* the exile of Liberius—is of no force; and he shows that the work, which would be incomplete without Nos. 89 and 90, must, therefore, have been written after the return of Liberius to Rome, because it speaks of the exile. But this is not the place to reproduce the arguments this learned writer employs. In Sulpicius Severus, *Historia*, lib. iv., c. 12, is preserved an encyclical of Liberius, published after the Council of Rimini, in which he anathematizes Arianism and exhorts all who fell, whether by weakness or by violence, to return at once to the bosom of the Church. But in the *Fragmenta* several such letters are extant bearing the name of Liberius; these are all heretical in tone, while the former is orthodox in every particular. All, however, admit the authenticity of the orthodox letter. How, then, could Liberius have the audacity, had he written the *heretical* letters, to set himself up as a teacher, and a reprover of the fallen, without at least retracting his former words, and apologizing for the scandal he had given? No apology appears; on the contrary, the tone is commanding and, therefore, indicative of the authority of innocence. Had he himself been guilty and among those who "suffered detriment to their faith by force or fraud," the world must have known it. If Rome became Arian all the bishops knew it; and before the chief bishop could command their respect, he owed the Catholic world an apology for this greatest of scandals.

Let us go a step further, and assert that, had he fallen, volumes of episcopal reproaches and countless decrees of protesting councils

would have deluged his fated throne, and plunged him into a sea of disgrace,—the roar of whose waves would at this distant day deafen our ears, and make a defence of Liberius impossible. Two inferences follow,—first, Liberius did not, could not, have fallen by subscribing the Sirmian formula and the condemnation of Athanasius; secondly, all letters which bear the name of Liberius, and represent him favoring the Arians, are forgeries. Another circumstance strengthens these conclusions. After the restoration of Liberius a council was convened by the Emperor at Seleucia, and another simultaneously at Rimini. The Bishop of Rome was not invited, and therefore neither he nor his legates had any part in it. Had he been an Arian, as claimed, this would have been the time to exhibit him on the "ministerial benches." After these unfortunate councils this Pope, who, we are told, had yielded to the Emperor, who had condemned Athanasius, and signed away his faith to regain his See, and eat his mess of pottage amid the seven hills, started suddenly into opposition, and anathematized the acts of the Emperor's council. Strange independence of a fallen and servile Pope! *Iniquitas mentita est sibi.*

Again, Lucifer Calaritanus (of Cagliari), in his book against Constantius, Faustinus and Marcellinus, in their work presented to Valentinian and Arcadius, mention the exile of Osius and of Liberius. They state that Osius yielded to the persecution, but not a word have they about the Bishop of Rome. Strange omission!

Sulpicius Severus, too, *Historia*, lib. ii., No. 39, says: "Liberius of Rome and Hilary are sent into exile . . . . . But Liberius is restored shortly after to Rome (Urbi) *on account of the sedition there.*" Farther on he states that Osius, then a doting centenarian, probably yielded; but he says nothing of the kind about Liberius. How could these authors all conspire, as it were, to conceal from history the crime of Liberius, the *greater* sinner, and to parade the defection of the *lesser* light? Ammianus Marcellinus, a pagan historian of this era, in lib. xv., chap. vii., after epitomizing the great quarrel between the Emperor and Athanasius, states that the former's will to banish the latter was opposed by the Bishop of the "Eternal City," who, because he would not yield, was with great difficulty carried off at night against the will of the people, who loved him dearly.[1] This well-informed historian lays great stress

[1] The author's words are: "Athanasium epum eo tempore apud Alexandriam . . . . altius se efferentem, ut prodidere rumores assidui cætus . . . . . (synodus ut appellant), removit a sacramento. Hunc per subscriptionem abjicere sede sacerdotali, paria sentiens cæteris, jubente principe, Liberius monitus perseveranter renitebatur, nec visum hominem nec auditum damnare, nefas ultimum sæpe exclamans, aperte scilicet recalcitrans imperatoris arbitrio. Id enim ille, Athanasio semper infestus, licet sciret impletum, tamen auctoritate quoque *potiore* æternæ Urbis Episcopi *firmari*, desiderio nitebatur ardenti; *quo non impetrato*, Liberius ægre populi metu, qui ejus amore flagrabat, cum magna difficultate noctis medio potuit absportari."

on the opposition shown by Liberius to the will of Constantius, but he does not say that the opposition at any time *ceased*, which cessation, had it ever taken place, the historian should and would necessarily have noted to make the narrative complete. Socrates says distinctly, lib. ii., c. xxxvii., that Liberius recovered his See shortly after his return (from exile); "for the Roman people, having become seditious, expelled Felix from the Church; and the Emperor, *though unwilling*, gave his assent." How could the Emperor be unwilling to restore Liberius to his See if the latter had fulfilled all his behests? It were inexplicable. Athanasius gives a full account of the trial made by Constantius to win over Liberius. When Eusebius, the eunuch sent by the Emperor to tempt the Pope with gold, received no better reception than Simon Magus, who tempted Peter, he resorted to threats. The interview thereupon ended, and the Pope replied to the threats by letter as follows: "You think to force me to subscribe to the condemnation of the Patriarch of Alexandria. How can I? Three consecutive councils, one of which represented the universal episcopate, have recognized, verified, and proclaimed the innocence of Athanasius. He was present. . . . . We ourselves have heard all the calumnies with which they would crush him peremptorily refuted. We have admitted him to our communion . . . . . We have pledged him the most tender affection; and now that he is absent, persecuted, proscribed, are we to hurl an anathema against him? No! such is not the rule of the ecclesiastical canons, nor the *tradition* of the blessed and great Apostle Peter, which our predecessors have transmitted to us. The Emperor, you say, wishes for peace; . . . . . let him commence by recalling the cruel edicts he has launched against the Patriarch; let him set Athanasius at liberty, and place him firmly in his See." *Hist. Arian.*, No. 36. Language like this was not calculated to appease an Emperor. The *Gesta Liberii*, a scroll lately discovered, tells us that for a time the Pontiff retired to the catacomb of Noella, in the Via Salaria, a voluntary exile; but his retreat was discovered, and he was led to Milan, where the Emperor held the following dialogue with him, reported in substance both by Athanasius and Theodoret. Said the Emperor: "As you are Bishop of our city, ... we exhort you to reject the communion of Athanasius. The world has judged him," etc.

Liberius: "Sir, ecclesiastical judgments must be just. Establish a tribunal, ... and, if he be found guilty, judgment will be pronounced . . . . . We cannot condemn a man who has not been tried."

Emperor: "The world has condemned his impiety."

Liberius: "Those who subscribed his condemnation have not

seen all that passed. The glory you promise them, or the punishment you threaten, has influenced them."

Emperor: "What do you mean by the words glory and punishment?"

Liberius: "Those who love not the glory of God, and prefer your favors, have condemned him without trial. This is unworthy of Christians."

Emperor: "He has been judged by the Council of Tyre, where he was present."

Liberius: "Not in his presence, but after his withdrawal." (Here a bishop, who was by, put in that Liberius wished to boast, on his return to Rome, that he had baffled the Emperor.)

Emperor: "What do you account yourself in the world, to raise yourself alone to disturb the earth?"

Liberius: "Even if I were alone, the cause of the faith would not fall." . . . . .

Emperor: "What has been once decreed cannot be reversed. The judgment of the majority of the bishops must decide, and you are the only one attached to this wretch."

Liberius: "Sir, we have never heard that, in the absence of the accused, a judge would consider him a wretch, as if he were his particular enemy."

Emperor: "He has offended the world in general, me in particular. . . . . I will send you back to Rome if you embrace the communion of the Churches. Yield for peace sake; subscribe, and return to Rome?"

Liberius: "I have already bid adieu to my brethren in Rome."

Emperor: "You will have three days to consider," etc. . . . .

Liberius: "Three days nor three months will not change my resolution. Send me where you like."

Here is language worthy of a Pope. Who can imagine this hero yielding cringingly afterwards to this very Emperor and retracting these sublime words? But if the Pope had prevaricated and condemned Athanasius, of what use would it have been for the latter to publish this interview? Both Athanasius and the Arian faction, and the whole world, in fact, knew the importance of having the Roman Bishop on their side. Hence the efforts made all around to secure his subscription. Hence the forgeries of the Arians, so unjust to Liberius. Hence, too, the *History* and other works written by the Bishop of Alexandria. It would, therefore, have been doubly absurd for Athanasius to hope for favor by claiming the Bishop of Rome's suffrage, if that suffrage had been reversed, and himself cut off from the Pope's communion.

But Theodoret, in lib. ii., c. 15, *et seq.*, of his *Ecclesiastical History*, accounts fully for the return of Liberius to Rome after his long

exile, and once for all settles the question at issue. Could any doubt remain after the evidence given above, the following account must dispel it: "The glorious athlete of the truth, Liberius, went into Thrace, as ordered; but after two years Constantius set out for Rome. The wives of the senators and nobility besought their husbands to approach the prince and ask him to restore the shepherd to his flock; adding that, if this were refused, they would leave their homes and migrate to their great shepherd. Their consorts said they feared the anger of the prince. 'He will, perhaps,' said they, 'not pardon us men; but if you ask him he will, doubtless, spare you. One, then, of two things will happen; he will either hear your prayers, or, if he refuse, he will at least send you away unhurt.' These most excellent women followed the advice, and approached the Emperor clad in elegant style, so as to insure a respectful reception on his recognizing them as nobles. Having come thus adorned before the Emperor, they suppliantly asked him to take pity on so great a city deprived of its shepherd and exposed to the fury of wolves. But he answered the matrons that the city did not want a second shepherd, having already a fit one to look after it; for, after the departure of the great Liberius, one of his deacons, Felix by name, was ordained. He, indeed, kept whole and inviolate the formula of faith expounded by the Fathers of Nice; but he communicated freely with those who had sullied it, and for this reason *none of the Roman citizens would enter the church while he was there*. This, too, the matrons made known to the Emperor. Yielding, therefore, the Emperor ordered *that illustrious man, worthy of all praise*, to return from exile."

Theodoret informs us, further on, that the sources of his information were "pious men still living." With evidence like this before him, it seems incomprehensible that any one could conceive the fall of Liberius to be other than a calumny of the blackest dye.

How, then, it will be asked, are we to account for the testimony of the Liber Pontificalis, of the *Fragmenta* of Hilary, or of St. Jerome, etc.? We might answer in general terms that, as the character of the Pope has been unanswerably vindicated, these so-called testimonies can be of no weight. But, to answer in detail, we say, 1st, as to the Liber Pontificalis. This is the journal of the Pope, so to speak, not compiled (as some have thought) by one person, but written up by many hands from a very remote period. This work informs us that Liberius was treated with by Ursatius and Valeus (his bitter enemies!), and recalled to Rome by the Emperor; but that, on his arrival there, he dared not enter, and besought the Emperor's cousin, Constantia, to intercede with the Emperor for him; that Felix was then expelled violently; that Liberius communicated freely with the Arians, and joined in a per-

secution of the clergy, who refused to receive him; that Felix died in peace, etc. Now this chapter is so full of contradictions that it at once reveals its origin. Firstly, Liberius is said to have come to terms with Constantius, and is recalled; yet he dares not enter Rome until he mollifies the Emperor through Constantia!—a glaring contradiction. Next, rebaptism is made to appear the theological difficulty between the Pope and the Emperor, though the question was not dreamt of at the time. Again, Liberius and Constantius are reported meeting in a council at Rome at a time (359) when the Emperor was in Pannonia warring with the Sarmatians and the Quadi. Fourthly, Felix was, we know, a *martyr;* yet, according to this book, he died naturally! As regards the persecutions at Rome, Liberius suffered with his clergy at the hands of the Arians. This self-contradictory chapter of the "Liber P." is, therefore, a forgery in the interest of the Arians, most probably written while that faction were in the ascendant at Rome.[1]

The *Fragments*, ascribed to St. Hilary, which accuse Liberius of signing an Arian formula, and of condemning Athanasius, are another forgery. St. Jerome knew nothing of them; for, in his enumeration of Hilary's works, he makes no mention of them. Next, they contradict the well-known convictions of Hilary, so oft repeated in his authentic works.

Rufinus, in his Church history, lib. i., speaking of the works of Hilary, is also ignorant of the *Fragmenta.* This author says that he is in doubt about the supposed fall of Liberius; but if he had read or heard of these *Fragments* (and he would if they existed), which so unhesitatingly record it, the authority of their author would have left no doubt in the mind of Rufinus, and he would have said simply, "Liberius fell." Furthermore, while the *Fragments* give all those letters which represent Liberius as an abettor of Arianism, they studiously omit mention of the famous orthodox epistle of this Pope. The Arian compiler was very cunning, but overreached himself. Either, then, the *Fragmenta* are spurious, or the other reputed works of Hilary must be considered unauthentic. The latter proposition is preposterous, "a lame and impotent conclusion," as all critics admit. The *Fragmenta* are, therefore, of no value, and the charge they support falls to the ground. In fact, the very existence of these forgeries over the renowned signature of Hilary would establish, in default of other evidence, the innocence of the man they accuse so boldly; for, the weaker and the more perverse the charge, the greater the desire of its inventors to father it on some great personage. 2d.

[1] Many chronologists, among them Muratori, are of opinion that the compilation of the Liber Pontificalis was not begun until somewhere in the eighth century. If this opinion is of any weight, the testimony of the work, as against Liberius, is nil.

The "Acta Enubii," discovered, in A. D. 1479, by Mombritius, and reproduced in his *Miscellanea* by Baluze in the seventeenth century, seemed for a time to establish the guilt of Liberius, and were relied on as genuine by Bossuet.[1]

They tell of a "man of God," Eusebius, who suffered martyrdom at the hands or with the complicity of Liberius, who had joined the Arians, etc. In a word, they are of the same tenor as the "Liber P." notice of Liberius; and betray the same spirit, if not the same hand. We know, contrary to these "Acta," that Pope Damasus praised the memory of his predecessor. We know, too, that the dialogue said to have taken place in Rome between the Pope and the Emperor in 359 is a fiction, yet the "Acts" record it.

Constantius never saw Rome after his month's stay in 358. These "Acts," or portions of them, are therefore self-confessed forgeries. 3d. We have the positive testimony of Jerome, who says that Liberius, "overcome with the hardships of exile, subscribed an heretical formula, and entered Rome as a conqueror." How shall we meet this? St. Jerome wrote far from the scenes he chronicled—in fact, in the Holy Land; and no doubt (unless the words be, as some contend, an interpolation) he wrote what he heard noised about him, some thirty years after the events, unsuspicious of the injury done a Pope by this horrid Arian slander. He alone, of all the Catholic writers of antiquity, asserts the guilt of Liberius, and he stands contradicted by the collective evidence of others so situated as better to know the truth. Like that of Bossuet, the dictum of Jerome, if genuine, was based on evidence regarded by him as *bona fide*, but which, in point of fact, was just the reverse. The opinion, that the sentence given from Jerome's *Chronicle* is also an Arian interpolation, has very strong arguments in its favor. We know that the works of Origen were tampered with, even during the lifetime of the author, by sectaries desirous of having the support of so great a name. He reclaimed, but in vain, and history has misjudged him. Athanasius and others complained of a like grievance. The wholesale forgeries of the Arians give us a presumption that this faction would secure Jerome's name, if possible. Besides, it is admitted that the *Chronicle* has, in fact, been interpolated, or otherwise disfigured; and Menochius (quoted by Barthélemy, *Errors and Historic Lies*) says, in this connection, that "there is not a trace of the fall of Liberius in the manuscript of the *Chronicles* of St. Jerome preserved in the Vatican, and given the Pope by the Queen of Sweden. This manuscript is

[1] Several other critics, even of that date, such as Pétan, Labbe, and Tillemont, either rejected the Acta, as fabrications of the Arians, or, at best, as very suspicious documents.

argued by Holstenius to be very ancient, and the learned believe it to have been written in the sixth or seventh century."

At best, then, the citation is doubtful, and therefore of no weight whatever. No wonder the historians should be so puzzled about which formula was signed, and to fix the date of the alleged fall of Liberius. A lie needs good backing, as liars need good memories. Both Socrates and Sozomen mentioned the matter in their histories, but they failed to mention on what basis they make their statements. They also disagree in their story; and Sozomen, who makes three references to the *fall*, disagrees with himself. Socrates places the exile, saying nothing of the fall, after the Council of Rimini (359). Sozomen, lib. iv., c. xi., says that, when Constantius went to Rome (358), he endeavored in vain to seduce Liberius, and exiled him. In c. xv. he says that the Emperor brought Liberius to Sirmium, and induced him to sign a formula made there (which one?), and that afterwards *rumors were set afloat* by Eudoxius and others that Liberius had condemned the word "consubstantial," and had acknowledged the Son dissimilar to the Father. In c. xix. he states that the Emperor enjoined on all to subscribe to the decrees of Rimini; and that those refusing, among them Liberius, Bishop of Rome, were driven from their sees. This is a sad mixture of dates and places!

But this chaos of forgery, folly, and fanaticism is growing tedious, and we must end somewhere. To recapitulate. 1st. It has been shown that the life of Liberius was irreproachable up to the year 355 or 356; that his letters to the exiled prelates, breathing a desire to suffer with them, his defiant attitude towards the Emperor, his rejection of all bribes, his long suffering in exile, the universal esteem in which his contemporaries held him, and, lastly, his condemnation of the decrees of Rimini, *after* his return from exile, establish the presumption of his innocence of the crimes of injustice, inconstancy, and apostasy. 2d. That the spirit of the Arians was one of lies and forgery, of which they were often convicted; and that the documents we have, accusing Liberius of apostasy, etc., bear evidence, internal and external, of interpolation, or worse. 3d. That whereas the Arian faction, with Constantius at its head, made frantic endeavors to secure the alliance of the Roman Bishop; and whereas such alliance would be of no use to them whatever, unless made known to the whole world by imperial proclamation, nevertheless there is no evidence to show that such a course was adopted; but, on the contrary, that "rumors (of the defection of Liberius) were set afloat," in an underhand way, were industriously circulated in the East, and afterwards wafted westward in documents bearing great names. This fact is the more remarkable, because the fall of Osius was published from the housetops as a

mighty victory. 4th. That, besides the negative and the circumstantial evidence adduced, we have the positive testimony of Sulpicius and of Theodoret that, not any criminal compliancy on the part of Liberius, but *the demand of the Romans*, induced the Emperor, much against his will, to restore the holy Bishop to his See. Is it any wonder, then, that turning to the Greek office we find Liberius catalogued among the saints? In the Greek *Menology* we read, at the 27th September, "The blesssed Liberius, defender of the truth, was Bishop of Rome during the reign of Constantius. His zeal . . . . . made him underake the defence of the great Athanasius. . . . . Then Liberius, who fought with his whole strength against the malice of the heretics, was exiled to Beræa in Thrace. But the Romans, who loved and honored him, remained faithful to him, and besought the Emperor to restore him. Liberius returned to Rome, where he died after wisely governing his flock."

The spirit of error has ever been busy among men opposing God's work, but in the end truth shall prevail. The God-man was misrepresented and his death secured by calumny, and His Vicar on earth may expect no better treatment. Man's reason and will are weak, and a divinely constituted authority alone can guide him into truth. Our Lord knew this, and gave us in His Vicar the corner-stone of His Church, this infallible authority. The enemy of our salvation knows it too, and hence his endeavors to pull down the Papacy by impugning its doctrinal infallibility. Had this authority once erred, Christ's promises were vain; His work a fraud or a failure. The Council of the Vatican decreed that the Pope, teaching *ex cathedrâ*, is infallible, which decree insures Catholics that neither Liberius, nor any other occupant of Peter's chair, has ever taught the Church error. Nevertheless, it is highly useful and satisfactory for us to know that the voice of history re-echoes that of authority, and proclaims that no shade of error has ever clouded the brow that wears the Papal crown. As the ruins of ancient greatness, discovered in Egypt and elsewhere, confirm many things related in Scripture, so, as fresh manuscripts and monuments of other days emerge from the dust of centuries, we shall find vindications of many who are now maligned, not because they deserve it, but because they represent Him who said to His followers, "Blessed are you when they shall revile you and persecute you; speak all things evil against you untruly for my sake; be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very great in heaven." Matt. v. 2.

Here is a Latin translation of the formula supposed to have been signed by Liberius, taken from the *Bullarium Romanum*, vol. iii.:

"Sirmiensis fidei confessio aut formula Semiarianorum a Marco

Arethusio epô græce conscripta, a Liberio subscripta hæc est. Credimus in unum Deum patrem omnipotentem creatorem et factorem omnium, in quo omnis paternitas in cælo est, et in terra nominatur. Et in unigenitum ejus filium Dm. Nm. Jm. Xm. ante omnia sæcula ex patre genitum ex Deo, lumen de lumine per quem omnia in cælis et in terra facta sunt, tam invisibilia quam visibilia; eumdemque verbum esse et sapientiam, lucem veram et vitam, et ultimis diebus hominem factum, natumque ex Sancta Virgine, crucifixum, et mortuum et sepultum esse, sedereque ad dexteram patris, venturumque in consummationem sæculi ut judicet vivos et mortuos, reddatque unicuique secundum opera sua. Cujus regnum indesinens permanebit in infinitas ætates. Sedet enim ad dextram patris non solum in hoc sæculo sed et in futuro. Et in spiritum sanctum hoc est paracletum quem promissum Apostolis post ascensum in cœlos, misit ut doceret eos et commonefaceret omnium. Per quem omnes animæ quæ in eum sinceriter credunt sanctificantur." (Here follow twenty-six explicative paragraphs or articles.)

THE NEW SOVEREIGNTY.

IN what sense is the new sovereignty a departure from the old sovereignty; or can it be said that there is any new sovereignty at all? The old sovereignty made authority to be the sure guide of duty; it did this because authority was divine in its origin, and divine within the compass of its control. In the old Christian idea,—in the Catholic apprehension,—there was the authority which was known as the supernatural, and the authority which was known as the natural. The supernatural authority was the authority of the Church; that is, the authority of the teaching Church to teach truth, and the authority of the Christian ministry to perform functions. From this major authority, best known as the spiritual, the minor authority, say the social and domestic, derived a character which was something more than merely natural. If the Church could teach truths in the divine sense of truths, and was also mistress of the whole compass of moral theology, she could obviously define the limits as well as generally prescribe the character of her own relations to both the State and the family. But the new sovereignty—which was first begotten of the Reformation, then travestied or developed by the Revolution, then worked out into a speculative system by modern

thought—has done away with the religious character of natural duties by doing away with the divine character of church authority. Thus the old sovereignty is *not* the sovereignty which governs Christendom, but only a sovereignty which governs members of the Catholic Church. And even in this measure—in the relation of practice to theory—the new sovereignty has robbed the old sovereignty of its harmony.

Shall we say, then, that the new sovereignty is a departure from the old sovereignty, in the sense that it makes authority to be an accident of convenience, instead of being God's rule *through* the Church? Obviously there are two schools which approve the new sovereignty; the school which still believes in Revelation, and the school which either rejects it or doubts it. The first school would be shocked if it were told that it repudiated the supernatural element in authority; and would reply that it accepted the Bible, and believed in the religious character of social duties. Of the second school, it suffices to say simply that it repudiates the supernatural element; and that neither an atheist nor a freethinker believes in any authority beyond such as the order of nature makes convenient. Yet, since the atheist and the freethinker, the cold skeptic and the modern thoughtist, are, to a certain extent, the offspring of Heresy, it may be desirable to trace first the deadly germs of the new sovereignty in a sectarianism which at least affected to be religious.

It has been said that "no man believes by logic," but it is certain that no man *thinks* he believes without it. Or, that a man should reject logic as being irrelevant to Christian faith, or as not auxiliary to the reasonableness of that faith, would be a symptom of an uneducated mind. Every Christian at least imagines that he reasons logically, whether he accept a part or accept the whole of the Christian faith. If, then, there be a syllogistic character about the reasonings of professing Christians,—that is, of course, of educated Christians,—how comes it that even their premises are at war like bitter enemies, and that a Q. E. D. means "my inference, not yours." The answer is, that Bible Christians create one strange premiss for themselves, and that premiss is, "I am my own judge of Revelation." They are right in their first premiss, that "Revelation is divine," but their next premiss is the negative of the first. And not only Bible Christians, but all schools of non-Catholics,—the most transcendental of the ritualists, like the loosest of broad churchmen, or the most scholarly of rationalistic latitudinarians, adopt for their second postulate the most irrational of assumptions, that "the human can interpret the divine." It matters not one straw whether a man chooses his fathers, or his councils, or his saints, or his doctors as his auxiliaries in interpreting divine doctrines; every man who makes "ego" his ultimate arbiter in selection,—in the selection of his own inter-

preters of Revelation,—is as essentially Protestant in his attitude towards authority as a preacher in the humblest conventicle.

You cannot make a syllogism unless you have two postulates, and those two postulates must be patent as the noonday sun. You may make sport of a postulate, for the mere enjoyment of mental play, but we all know what is meant by a postulate. Thus: "Every man thinks; John is a man; therefore John thinks," may be made sport of on the ground that really but few men can be said to think; and that as to John, he is the most thoughtless of persons. Yet even in this case all the world knows our meaning, and all the world attributes the faculty which we postulate. But in the grand syllogism which may be built up for the Catholic faith, there is no room for any possible play, for any escape from a sufficient Q. E. D. That "Revelation is divine" is that one common belief which all Christians accept for their first postulate; and this, not only as regards its divine Author, but equally as regards all its doctrine. Yet when we come to the human intelligence of what we have admitted to be divine, Catholics alone can affirm (and they can logically demonstrate) that "Divine doctrines require an infallible interpreter."

The old sovereignty was grounded on this last principle. The new sovereignty is grounded on its rejection. Herein lies the divorce which modern thought has created, not only between dogma and sentiment, between authority and popularly accepted creeds, but also between *duties* and *conveniences* in the whole range both of politics and of social ethics. The old sovereignty so impregnated every department of life, that from the emperor to the peasant, from the judge to the attorney's clerk, from the father to the son, from the parish priest to the sexton, one and the same authority made one and the same spirit of duty to possess the intellects and the consciences of all Christians. The new sovereignty has allowed the religious sentiment to survive—that is, in the case of professing Christians—but it has taken out the backbone of almost all Christian duty, by making every man his own interpreter of the idea, duty.

It would be too large a field over which to travel leisurely, if we were to write down all the social and the political changes which have come about from the acceptance of the new sovereignty. It may be said, perhaps, that a free press has both embodied and established the reign of changeful convenience over duty. A free press means the advocacy of private judgment, in regard to all points of religious faith, as well as all points of social ethics, irrespective of any authority beyond such as the civil power and the adopted canons of society may approve. A free press ignores God, save only in such sense as private judg-

ment may apprehend His existence. It may graciously lay down the postulate, "God is;" but it claims the right to apprehend both His being and His providence in the measure which its own bias may most commend. Here, then, is *not* the sovereignty of God, but the sovereignty of "my own private opinion of Him." Take the normal (religious) attitude of modern thought in regard to the religious side of political questions. Fifty years ago, in England, the old cry of "Church and State" meant an alliance, if not a union of the two; it meant at least, "there is a true religion, and it is the duty of the political powers to recognize it." Meagre as was such a confession of political duties, at least it was better than French Paul Bertism. True, the English government, from the time of the Reformation, had divorced political duties from Catholic obedience; it had centred all religious authority in itself; it had even created a brand new Established Church, and had created brand new thirty-nine articles; still, there was the admission that "religion and politics could and did go together theoretically." It is perfectly true that what we are speaking of as the new sovereignty was proclaimed and embodied by the Anglican Parliament, in its usurpation of teaching powers in regard to religion; and it is perfectly true that Paul Bertism is only a logical outcome of the principle, "The State rules the Church, and may therefore quash it." Sooner or later, it was certain that private judgment, whether mantled by the lofty patronage of crown and Parliament, or left to meander in its own currents in private heads, must lead on to private rejection of all authority, on the ground that "no man can bow the head to his own authority." The very idea of authority, even in the natural order, is the idea of a power outside oneself; while, in the supernatural order, it is the idea of a power, not only outside but infinitely above oneself. The Catholic philosophy has been always grounded on this truism; but so-called Anglicanism has never formulated a philosophy. Hence, when Rationalism came to lay hold of the Anglican mind, and to urge that reason was independent of clerical teaching, Rationalism came off conqueror, because the only accepted clerical teaching was, in fact, the salaried teaching of State functionaries. Rationalism, in its appeal to Catholics, had to combat the dual position, that divine dogma is always assured to them by a divine interpreter; that is, by an interpreter divinely aided to interpret, in such measure as to be what we understand by "infallible." [The word is imperfect English, but it suffices to convey this meaning,—an authority which is divinely prevented from making mistakes.] Rationalism, therefore, made few conquests among Catholics. But among Protestants its victories were rendered easy, because the sole authority for Protestant doctrine is *a* Protestant's reason. We need not insist upon

the distinction between Catholic "dogma,"—rendered certain by the infallibility of the interpreter,—and Protestant "doctrine," rendered uncertain by private judgment; the distinction is so obvious that it suffices to state it as a fact which is closely linked with our whole argument. Rationalism could not attack the Catholic philosophy without attacking its primary safeguard, an aided interpreter; whereas in attacking the Protestant illusion, its work was made easy, by frankly adopting the Protestant postulate, "private judgment."

The new sovereignty is, therefore, both in its theory and in its practice, the conservation of the authority of private judgment, and this judgment is only restrained from violent action by the sentiment of "public propriety," which is traditional. The best way to test the logic of any theory is to drive it to its ultimate possibilities, and it is certain that the Catholic theory will bear that test, as it is certain that non-Catholic theories will not. Sovereignty is a fearless word to use, yet Catholics can use it without fear. The Catholic philosophy, which, having accepted Revelation, proceeds to logically correlate an infallible teacher, can as logically lay it down that the precise limits of infallible teaching are known infallibly by the infallible teacher. The Church—to use the word in its didactic sense—knows what it can teach, and what it cannot teach; knows how far it can prescribe any social or domestic duty; knows the limits of its authority in dictating to secular governments, or in even (spiritually) commanding their obedience. It is quite possible that what may be called the executive power, in the mundane intercourse of the Holy See with secular governments, may be at fault through misapprehension of actual facts (as in the case of the quarrel of King John with his barons, when Pope Innocent not only annulled the grand charter, but "excommunicated all disturbers of the public peace," because His Holiness had been misinformed as to actual facts, and had been led to believe that the barons were to blame); but, in regard to all questions of faith and morals, and their bearings on the relative duties of kings and subjects, there is no possibility of the Holy See making a mistake. The judgment in particular cases may be erroneous, but the judgment as to divine principles cannot be. Thus we drive the Catholic theory to its ultimate possibilities, and we see that, beyond mistakes in the executive (now rendered very improbable from the swiftness of intercourse, though in earlier times scarcely avoidable through slow journeyings), the divine principle, which we have called the old sovereignty, was a guarantee of not only spiritual security, but of the security of public justice *through* spiritual teaching. The worst that could possibly happen under the old sovereignty was a delay in the rectification of public quarrels; but,

in point of right or wrong, both as to dogma and as to morals, the teaching Church was the divine security of kings and subjects.

The exact opposite of these truths, both in reason and experience, will be found to issue from the process of "driving" the principle of the new sovereignty to what we have called its ultimate possibilities. Yet, we have no need to speculate as to any possible future; let us take the new sovereignty as it is. The "possibilities" have been already fully reached. The "argument from the absurd" has been worked out. In church government we see the laity practically teaching their clergy, obliging them to adopt their doctrines—from "Canterbury" down to the rural curate—to the prevalent apprehension of "enlightened views." And, just as Bible Christianity had developed hundreds of sects, each of which combated the doctrines of all the others, so Ritualism, which affects to honor *past* authority, is proverbially contemptuous of *present* authority. Indeed, Ritualism has done this service to the Protestant intellect, that it has put before it the principle of the new sovereignty worked into absolute completeness from both extremes. Private judgment has gone mad in the wildness of its inventions (in the case of the modern Ritualist sect), to the extent even of creating "mass" out of a Protestant service—which service was invented expressly to displace the mass—and to the extent of creating a fictitious system of obedience out of a system which was built up solely on disobedience. It is impossible to pass hastily over this last unique instance of the most "respectable" of the developments of the new sovereignty. Private judgment—which was the new sovereignty—had dethroned authority. At the very best, it had transferred obedience to the State, or to state-made courts, or to the private influences of honored pastors or honored friends. Ritualism came to the rescue in proposing a past authority as a substitute for the living authority of the Catholic Church, and, ridiculing private judgment, proceeded to make every man a pontiff, as judging councils, fathers, saints, even all the popes. It would not hear of any obedience being shown to my Lord of London, —still less, to that supreme state-trimmer, his Grace of Canterbury—but required every man to monopolize all the powers of the teaching Church, by requiring every man to judge infallibly all that it taught. Ritualism is the coronation of the wildest extremes of private judgment, making that judgment to judge infallibly its devoted teacher. The old Protestantism said: "We have no teacher; we teach ourselves out of our private judgment of Bible teaching." Ritualism says: "We have a teacher; that teacher is what we call the Primitive Church; but we claim the right, and the intellectual fitness, to judge infallibly of all the teachings of all the teachers of the first five centuries of the Christian Church; and, as

to our modern Anglican bishops, if they cannot agree with us, it is obvious that we must try to teach them to do so." Ritualism obeys an authority, which has been dead and buried for a thousand years, but only obeys it on the condition that each individual Ritualist must be the sole infallible interpreter of what it taught. Modern sovereignty has culminated in Ritualism. No further extravagance is even conceivable. Private judgment, with this last sect, has gone beyond even its apparent ultimatum, in setting up an infallible authority, dead and buried for a thousand years, to be privately judged by every person who claims the privilege, to be privately condemned where it seems to assert Catholic authority, but privately honored where it seems to confirm Ritualist "views."

It was impossible not to notice this eccentric phase of the new sovereignty; not to speak of it as the grandest fallacy the world has known. The world is indebted to the Ritualists for having invented a fallacy which "Euclid" would have intensely appreciated as infinitely comic. Minor fallacies shrink into contemptible insignificance by the side of that fallacy which proposes obedience to a dead authority, on condition that *we* may teach the honored remains. The opposite extreme—which was profoundly venerating one's own "reading" of the whole of both the Old and the New Testament—was a childlike vanity, a simple weak-headed complacency, which had become consecrated by three centuries of tradition. Nor was it a fallacy wholly without an apology. Our friends, the Dissenters, are not unworthy of our respect, on the ground of saying that "the Holy Spirit guides their minds." It is a pious belief, and it is not without some truth, in the sense in which pious persons intend it. Dissenters do not care about dogma, do not think that there need be any dogmas, and, in their simple idea that "belief in Christ makes a Christian," they must be left outside the intellectual reasoning as to "sovereignty." They do not go to first principles, but they rest on religious sentiment; and there we must leave them, and—we say it respectfully—as we leave good children to be good in their simple way. But, unhappily, out of this childlike, ignorant innocence, has sprung the apology—adopted by persons who are not childlike—for rejecting all religion *with* all dogma. Reasoning people apprehend that the doctrines which come from God—as distinct from the commandments which come from God—cannot be infallibly apprehended by natural intelligence; or rather, to speak more accurately, that the mysteries of the divine wisdom can only be infallibly "defined" by the divine wisdom. If, therefore, the interpreter be not infallibly aided, there is an end of all infallible definition. The realization of this truism—for the simplest of truisms it is—has obliged

all persons who do not accept the Catholic authority to fall back on one of two only alternatives: they must either give up all dogma, as not an essential of Christianity, or they must reject Christianity altogether. Both these "schools" come within the empire of the new sovereignty. And thus, religiously, the new sovereignty means heresy and schism gone mad, where it does not mean the rejection of Revelation and the deification of self-worship in its place.

II.

Politically, the consequences of this deification of self-worship—for it is not precisely the deification of self, but the deification of the *principle* of self-worship—has led to two results in chief: first, the secularizing of all government; next, the persecution of Catholics. Under the old sovereignty all governments accepted certain principles, which principles were laid down by Catholic authority. Justice and morality were not defined by the government, but were adopted in their Catholic signification. Now, here let it be stated that it is most irrational to confuse facts, each of which must stand on its own justification. The Church is not responsible for the disobedience of governments to its doctrinal or to its moral authority; nor are Christian subjects responsible for the disobedience of their governments, nor of revolutionists, in any sense of the word. It is perfectly certain that just as the principles of good and evil must always contend in the individual subject, so the principles of good and evil must always contend in whole nations, in governments, in political systems, or evolutions. Yet no amount of historical scandals can ever affect the Catholic principle, that all government ought to be based on the Catholic faith, so that, both on the part of the governing powers and on the part of those who are governed, the Catholic faith should sanctify mutual relations. This was always the *principle* of the old sovereignty. It was not, we know, always the practice,—the practice of Catholic governments,—but, as a principle, it was universally recognized. The Church had a system of laws—it has now—which is known as Canonical Right. In this system we find it taught that "so long as princes and their laws are in conformity to the law of God, the Church has no power or jurisdiction against them or over them." But it is also stated that "the Church has a right to carry out her divine mission in every land, and to do so, if need be, in spite of the civil power." The true idea, therefore, of "Church and State" must be the alliance of the two, each respecting the other in its own sphere, yet the State being necessarily inferior to the Church, in creation, in endowment, in object. "Separation of Church and

State" has been authoritatively condemned from the time of St. Ambrose to that of Cardinal Manning. So has the theory that the State may control the Church, in faith, morals, jurisdiction, or education. The "philosophy" of the true relations of Church and State is so simple that even a child should understand it. Profound thinkers and deep essayists may work out the severe principle which Aristotle laid down before the Christian era, that "all authorities and societies are related to one another in proportion to the relation existing between their ends," and many thus show, by elaborate reasoning, that a divine society with eternal objects must take the precedence of human societies with temporal objects; yet it seems simpler to argue that all States which are called Christian must be taught their Christian duties by the teaching Church. If they refuse to be so taught, they are not Christian. They are, therefore, unfaithful to the Christian subjects whom they govern, not only in their bad example of disobedience, but in their not setting the highest example of perfect loyalty. Cavour and Garibaldi in Italy, Gambetta and Paul Bert in France, Dr. Falk and Prince Bismarck in Germany, Lord Palmerston and Mr. Gladstone in England, are all types of men who place the State above the Church, to the utter contempt even of the traditional sentiment of Catholic obedience. Having got rid of the divine authority of the teaching Church, they are compelled to exalt themselves into amateur pontiffs. This last attitude was certain to follow upon the first. *Some* authority must exist in every nation, to deal with the religious side of a nation's politics; and, since the true authority is rejected, there is only one possible alternative,—to make the authority of the State usurp its place.

This is what our modern liberals try to effect. They *have* effected it in some Christian countries. While professing to abhor Socialism, they adopt one of its ugliest fallacies, that the State is the earthly deity of a pure society. In Germany, where the government is a Cæsarism modified by a more or less obedient parliament, the State has striven for ten years to become the supreme arbiter in all controversies which belong to the empire of religion. The State would select and appoint parish priests with reference to their political partisanship. The State would monopolize education. The State would require a bishop to kneel to it, to ask permission to excommunicate an unworthy priest. The State would appoint its own (infidel) official to preside over the religious studies of all seminarists. The "regium placitum," as it is grotesquely misnamed, means, really, that all letters of the Supreme Pontiff must be scrutinized by a board of lay examiners, one of whom is a Jew, another a Protestant, a third a bad Catholic, and the fourth an avowed infidel. These gentlemen have supreme power to ad-

vise as to the "regium placitum," which, of course, is not royal at all, but simply infidel. This is a comic development of the new sovereignty. It was totally impossible that it should be otherwise developed. When the State becomes Pontiff it becomes possessed. When the people forsake the Church they become slaves. They are either slaves to the selfish Cæsar of the hour, or slaves to the selfish demagogue of the hour. [We need not speak of the third kind of wretched slavery, that of being victimized by every caprice of private judgment.] A people which has lost the guidance of Catholic authority, tumbles about from one tyranny to another, or from one frantic excess to another, and being usually reined and bitted by some popular leader, who persuades it that it is perfectly free and enlightened, rejoices in its own enslavement to the political hero of its illusions, because he *calls* himself a Liberal or a Radical. M. de Hauleville said, "Chez les nations Catholiques la liberté civile est ancienne, l'absolutisme est moderne;" and a truer remark could not be made, nor one which could be interpreted in a larger sense. It is true of the absolutism of demagoguism, as it is true of the absolutism of Cæsarism. Germany just now illustrates the second kind; France just now illustrates the first kind. In Germany neither Catholic nor Protestant has for a long while known the dignity of freedom. [They have *never* known it since the apostasy of the Reformation.] While the base servility of the French Radical herd to its immediate hero is only equalled by the mocking faithlessness of that hero to the real interests, spiritual and temporal, of his dupes. The hero promises peace; the herd believes him. But the herd does not want peace, it wants war. Peace to an infidel Radical would be a kind of death. Was it Deputy Malinckrodt who said in the Prussian Diet: "If true patriots make peace with false patriots, doubtless they will enjoy a kind of peace; the same peace which reigns in the churchyard?" But would either class of patriots enjoy peace? Only for about twenty-four hours. Radicalism,—not in its merely political sense, in the sense of wishing to alter a form of government, but in the sense of that headlong infidelity which scorns religion as the antagonist of liberty,—knows no peace, and will give none so long as a still wilder outburst is conceivable by its excited fancy. To insult religion for the simple pleasure of insulting it, is the fondest pastime of its political fitfulness. For example: The Radical electors of Northampton might have found many a workingman of high character who would have respectably represented them in Parliament, but the braggadocios of that constituency derived an exceptional gratification in picking out an unsavory atheist. This is the superlative degree of Radical spite. It is not political Radicalism—which is a legitimate theory, and may be consistent with the Christian faith—

but irreligious Radicalism, anti-religious Radicalism, the digging up of all the foundations of Christian States.

Spain has just refused, by an overwhelming majority, to do away with the (theistic) oath in the Parliament. France has not as yet abolished appeal to God. Italy and Austria still preserve it. But England is now in the throes of an inquiry as to whether she shall set a fiendish example. Now, let it be stated that the great majority of the English people are most ardently on the side of "Religious Conservatism;" more than this, the great majority of the English people are still attached to (at least) the traditions of the old sovereignty. Accepting what we have called the old sovereignty as the divine supremacy of religion over the whole world; as that ever-present and intensely realizable superiority before which all secular governments must bow down; the majority of the English people are good to the core, full of backbone, of sound sense, of religious will, and only wanting a thorough knowledge of Catholic truth to make them the most Christian people in the world. More than this, the humbler classes,—not the lower or the vulgar classes,—are imbued with refined instincts of respect for truth, nor must they be confused with that political residuum which howls radicalism from its stolid ignorance, moral depravity, or force of contact. There is in England, as in most countries, a scholarly radical class which simply aims at a vast extension of political liberties. These men have a profound contempt for infidel radicalism. But there is also a large class which would define radicalism as the popular right to pull down every church and chapel in the kingdom, to make Timothy Stubbs president of an infidel republic, provided that he hated noblemen and capitalists, and to do away with such restrictions upon morals and upon manners as hamper the perfect liberty of the citizen. True, this is an extreme class of the new radicalism. But how came it to have any existence? The answer, that liberal leaders, who are themselves respectable men, and who would resent the imputation of a low radicalism, are constantly, for the sake of "party," for the sake of gaining political followers, affecting to favor what they know to be wrong. Mr. Gladstone, who reads the lessons in his parish church, brings in a relief bill for Mr. Bradlaugh, not because he likes filthy atheism, but because he likes to take the lead in all liberalism. Mr. Gladstone is a prime minister of the new sovereignty. That sovereignty has dethroned divine authority. Because the State *is*,—not *should* be—above religion, therefore statesmen must put their politics above their God.

Dr. Benson, the new Archbishop of Canterbury, has just shown how the new sovereignty in religion is in close sympathy with the new sovereignty in politics. How should they not be in close sympathy, seeing that they were both born together? Dr. Ben-

son waits on the ministry which appointed him, before he commits himself to a repudiation of the affirmation bill. He lacks the courage of St. Ambrose, who in the fourth century told the Emperor (and would not have hesitated to tell a prime minister) to attend to his purely temporal affairs, and not to presume to have a voice in any sacred affair. But this was in the days when the old sovereignty would have made it impossible that a Christian government should have brought in an affirmation bill. Such a question must have been submitted to the spiritual power, though indeed it could not possibly have arisen. The spiritual power was the foundation of the temporal power; the Church being the mother of Christian nations. There was a complete distinctness, but a complete harmony of the two powers. As St. Thomas wrote: "The ministry of this (the spiritual) kingdom, in order that things spiritual be kept distinct from things temporal, is not intrusted to earthly kings, but to priests, and especially to the high priest, Peter's successor, Christ's vicar, the Roman Pontiff, to whom all the kings of Christian peoples are bound to be subject, as to Jesus Christ Himself." Dr. Benson, who may be styled, without any exaggeration, the archbishop of both provinces of the new sovereignty, tells his clergy that the Relief of Atheists Bill is a matter for the State, not for the Church. Is he not encouraged by the pervading secularism of the age? Christendom is a thing of the past. Christendom was the alliance of Christian nations with the spiritual sovereignty of the Catholic Church; so that all governments were based on the principle that the spiritual alliance *alone* made them legitimate. The new sovereignty has annihilated Christendom by not only divorcing the State from the Church, but by giving the State the right to ignore the Church, to control the Church, to teach the Church as it thinks best.

III.

Lastly, that we may very briefly trace the effect of the new sovereignty upon what is commonly understood by "society," let us begin by quoting the words of Cardinal Newman, uttered in Rome in the spring of 1879: "The goodly framework of society was the *creation* of Christianity." His Eminence did not say that society was the "accident," but that it was the offspring, the legitimate family of that religion which was taught to us in Bethlehem and on Calvary. Before Christianity there was no society. The reason is that society should mean a family of families; the sovereign principle of Christian authority governing all. Now, just as the old *dictum* of Christian States was, "Christianity is law;" but the new

dictum is, "The law makes Christianity, or, what is the same thing, can modify it;" so the old *dictum* of society was, "Society is Catholicity;" but the new *dictum* is, "Society is classes." It would be unreal to say that society, in any period of the Christian era, was wholly knit by one fellowship of Catholicity, just as it would be unreal to say that society, in its modern conventional sense, is wholly disunited by "religious liberty."

It is of principles that we are speaking, and the principle of society *was* Catholicity; the principle of society *is* classes. The new sovereignty of private judgment, beginning with schism, proceeding with political pontificalism (that is, the State taking the place of the teaching Church) has naturally and necessarily broken up the social fabric into as many discordant items as there are discordant "views." Society is, therefore, as dead as is Christendom. Classes aggregate for political convenience, for social or for commercial convenience, but society, in the sense of the family-bond, has no existence in any (whole) Christian country. The principle of Christendom used to be harmony; this corollary of schism is classes. We must, doubtless, blame some Catholics, even in the most Catholic times—and we must, also, blame most Catholics of our own time—for making worldliness to ride roughly over Christian harmony; in short, for class pride, class vulgarity. Conventionalism has dried the sap of Catholic charity. Religion is made one thing, but social fellowship is made another, so that between religion and society there is divorce. The old idea was a sort of marriage of the two. It might be mainly an idea, but this was better than the modern approved fallacy that each class should move integrally within itself. It is curious that political Liberalism, which was the offspring of religious Liberalism, has resulted in social rupture, social hatred. Hatred is not too strong a word to use in regard to this seeming attitude of class to class. Conventional pride has so rotted the social fabric that not only classes but minute sections of classes lift up the hem of their garments from each other. Catholicity is displaced by conventionalism. One sufficient explanation can be given. We can imagine a typical society, in which, all classes being refined by the highest tone of Catholic faith and Catholic sentiment, modesty and mutual respect would be as "natural" between all classes as is vanity and mutual distrust at the present time. But schism and heresy, religious Liberalism,—which means self-worship,—political Liberalism,—which means pulling *down* your superiors instead of pulling yourself *up* to their level,—together with a gross materialism of object or aspiration, such as now really "motives" half the world, have brought about such a low standard of social striving or emulation, that we must, most of us, feel our cowardice and our little-

ness. Disraeli said: "Life is too short to be little," but we, most of us, make it shorter by our own littleness. The new sovereignty in the social life, as in the religious and in the political life, has made littleness to be the stamp of human life. Personal heroism seldom dares to go beyond the social canons; it contents itself by being superlative within those canons. Yet the very idea of Catholic heroism was the being so untrammelled by the world as to live above it in both action and end.

Family life suffers with social life from this littleness of the new sovereignty of private judgment. A youth creating his own religion and his own politics; completing, at eighteen years, his own system of philosophy, his own canons of "the grammar of assent;" respects his father as "the governor," but, disagreeing with him on many points, lives enjoyably without reference to parental views. Religion being a private conception, politics being chiefly a game at parties, morality being social propriety, charity being "giving a copper," and magnanimity in general being muscular or robust, as distinguished from the grandeur of self-sacrifice, the age does not present to us a type of Christian youth which, except in mere profession, is not pagan. Such manliness takes a low material form. Manliness would be the acting on severe principles, without the slightest reference to conventional smallness or human respect. It would be the honoring of principles, not of self. But manliness in these days is the honoring of self, whether the principle be perfect or be faulty. We find in the humbler classes of English people almost perfectness both of manliness and of aspirations, but it is exceptional to find either in the higher classes, or even in the upper middle or wealthy classes.

A cowardly homage to conventional smallness rules the world. The fact that the lower orders (not the humbler orders) have bad manners, is made the pretext for having nothing to do with them, instead of being the soundest reason for "pulling them up." There could be no such thing as "lower orders," if all classes did their duty in good example, in keen sympathy, in modest manners. But the principles of the new sovereignty of self-worship have so permeated all the strata of social life—save only the purer types of the humbler orders—that isolation not sympathy, caste-vanity not generousness, complacent manners not kindliness or tenderness, make the barriers of class-life harder and harder. In family life, almost as much as in social life, there is a flying-off from dutiful sympathies and chivalrous sacrifice, with a disposition to make "ego" the one object of all endeavor, in success, in enrichment, in comfort.

Thus, religiously, politically, socially, and also within the sacred homes of private life, we may see that the new sovereignty has

corrupted civilization; has made civilization to mean the using of modern appliances for the greatest possible enjoyment of selfish repose. We speak, of course, of societies, not of persons. Principles are not to be judged by rare apologists, nor are developments to be tested by rare types. Every one knows that there are thousands of persons "in society," thousands of Anglicans, of Dissenters, perhaps of freethinkers, who for seriousness, and even intenseness of life, might be honored by doctors or even saints. A man is made by his circumstances, until the time shall arrive—and it arrives, perhaps, to most men—when he can make himself out of his own opportunities. Indeed, the superiority of individuals in modern times shows equally what immense merit there is in themselves, and what immense power there is in their traditions. We are constantly struck with admiration at some profoundly thoughtful remark made by some one from whom we least expected it, showing that his instincts are intensely Catholic, hugely wide, though perhaps he does not know even a single Catholic. The traditions of the old sovereignty which governed Christendom for fifteen centuries, have so penetrated men's natures that, only catch them in happy moments, and you find that perhaps most men, at the bottom of their hearts, are as Catholic as if they had been born Catholics. The surface is smeared over by conventionalism; but the new sovereignty would lose the majority of its subjects if they would all do justice to themselves by opportunity. And, at this point, let it be hazarded that the chief reason why true principles, both in the supernatural and in the natural order, do not captivate, do not convert, modern thoughtists, is that what is good is so very often put before the world in an aspect which is more conventional than Catholic. May it be permitted to say, diffidently, that the *mise en scène* of the Catholic Church does not strike an ousider as supernatural.

There is an apparent homage to a good deal the world thinks its own. True, all this is but *mise en scène;* it is the result mainly of habit or timidity; it is the mere outsideness of perhaps necessary etiquette, which in a vulgar world must be kept up. Yet,—if a private layman may be forgiven for frankly stating an impression derived from his observations in many countries,—it seems to him that a more primitive simplicity, *plus* a more courageous contempt for the world's gods [what are they but rank, influence, possessions; with pomp, ceremony, giving and taking of the world's titles?], in short, a bold return to the "style" of the primitive Catholics, who must have a most manly contempt for unrealities, would quickly convince society that Catholicity *is* divine, because it is not conventional or like the world. Catholics alone know the inside of the Catholic Church, non-Catholics know only its outside. If

the outside were the true face of the inside, if all Catholics would root out of the Catholic Church those appearances,—those mere appearances,—of world-copying, which are as false to individual Catholics as to the Catholic spirit, "the world" would sooner be captivated by the presentment of a religion which was the *only* state of being which was not conventional. It is sufficient here to speak only "in the general." It would be bad form to enter into particulars. The greatest society in the world is the Catholic Church, and it is the greatest because it is God's society. It is often made to *look* earthly by the genuflections of its magnates to the puerile smallness and vanity which rot the world. The new sovereignty, which is a false liberalism, a false radicalism, would be quickly shamed if it always saw in the old sovereignty the purest worship of simplicity and magnanimity. It is the big people of the world who have created radicalism. The humbler orders have an instinctive love of "superiority," not so much of mere talent or witching gifts, of position, or of the accidents of prosperity, as of that grandeur of nature which cares only for what is truest, and puts all the shams of the world under its feet. Religiously, politically and socially, the humbler orders are convertible to the highest standards, if only they can find the types which they can appreciate. How many such types do they see? In the parish priest, or among the exceptional Catholic laity, they very often, as we know well, see such types. But a whole country looks less at individuals than it looks at the presentment of the idea; and it is for this reason that the presentment should be so palpably *above* society, that society should say, "This is *not* the world."

BOOK NOTICES.

THE WORKS OF ORESTES A. BROWNSON. Collected and Arranged by Henry F. Brownson. Vol. IV. Containing the Writings on Religion and Society prior to the Author's Conversion. Detroit: Thorndike Nourse, Publisher. 1883.

The editor, in his Preface to this volume of the works of Orestes A. Brownson, says that it was not without much hesitation that he prepared it for publication. It contains many false theories and much rationalism, naturalism, and hardly disguised atheism. They are put forth, too, with such plausibility and power of argument, and are so closely connected with truths or seeming truths, and with a depth of thought and eloquence of style that make them all the more dangerous. The starting-point, as the editor says, "is as far from Catholic truth as it is possible to get without openly denying all religion and even the existence of any being superior to man. Our blessed Saviour is, indeed, admitted to be the Son of God; but in the same breath it is claimed that all men are equally sons of God. The worship of God is restricted to the service of man, and the only means of attaining to a heaven hereafter is declared to be the creation of heaven on earth. It is attempted to reconcile the aspirations of the soul with the desires of the body, spiritual and eternal with carnal and temporal interests, not by subjecting the latter to the former, the lower to the higher, but by declaring all equally great, holy, and important."

Such being the character of a large part of the writings comprised in this volume, it is not surprising that the editor at first hesitated to prepare them for republication. As he well says, whatever is likely to tend to spread false or erroneous views of God, the Church, or society, is equally condemned by the laws of religion and the dictates of reason. But he solves the difficulty thus raised by the statement that the question is simply whether the heterodox writings of Dr. Brownson, when collected in a volume by themselves and placed nearly, if not quite, in the order in which they were originally produced, are suited to confirm or to refute the errors they contain. In addition to other reasons for believing that Dr. Brownson's heterodox writings, thus arranged, will not confirm the errors he at first advocated but afterwards rejected, the editor well says:

"If the author had been warring against the truth, trying to overthrow revelation or morality, his writings would not usually exert an evil influence on the reader. But such is by no means the case. He is sincerely seeking for truth, and constantly eliminating from his theories the element of error contained in them. Starting from the borders of utter infidelity he advances slowly but steadily through the pages of this volume to the threshold of the Church. His thought grows steadily with each paper. Without intercourse with Catholics or their books, and without other premises than those supplied by Protestantism and rationalism, with no other tools than an earnest mind and a sincere love of truth, the author cuts for himself a path through the gloomy forests of infidelity, atheism, eclecticism, naturalism, humanitarianism, Fourierism and communism, until he arrives at the open light of truth in the Church of Christ. An unbeliever reading this journal, as it might be called, of a long struggle can hardly fail to be carried along with the writer, and the sympathies no less than the intelligence of the reader will lead him

to the conclusion which the author arrives at in the last few pages, that the only medium of salvation is the Catholic Church."

In the opening article of the volume, entitled *New Views* of Christianity, Society and the Church, amid all its errors, and there are many, the author strenuously maintains that Protestantism is merely the reassertion of materialism or paganism. The following extracts furnish a fair idea of Dr. Brownson's then views of Protestantism:

"That Protestantism is the insurrection of matter against spirit, of the material against the spiritual order, is susceptible of very satisfactory historical verification."

"One of the most immediate and efficient causes of Protestantism was the revival of Greek and Roman literature. Constantinople was taken by the Turks, and its scholars and the remains of classical learning were dispersed over Western Europe. The classics took possession of the universities and the learned, were studied, commented on, appealed to as an authority paramount to the Church and——Protestantism was born."

"By means of the classics, the scholars of the fifteenth century were introduced to a world altogether unlike and much superior to that in which they lived—to an order of ideas wholly diverse from those avowed or tolerated by the Church. They were enchanted. They had found the ideal of their dreams. They became disgusted with the present; they repelled the civilization effected, ... and sighed, and yearned, and labored to reproduce Athens or Rome."

"And what was that Athens and that Rome which seemed to them to realize the very ideal of the perfect? We know very well to-day what they were. They were material; through the whole period of their historical existence, it is well known that the material or temporal order predominated over the spiritual. . . . In Athens and Rome . . . . human interests, the interests of mankind in time and space predominate. Man is the most conspicuous figure in the groups. He is everywhere, and his imprint is on everything. Industry flourishes; commerce is encouraged; the State is constituted. . . . Religion is merely a function of the State. Numa introduces or organizes polytheism at Rome for the purpose of governing the people by means of appeals to their sentiment of the holy; and the Roman Pontifex Maximus was never anything more than a master of police."

"This in its generality is equally a description of Protestantism, as might have been asserted beforehand. . . . In classical antiquity, religion is a function of the State. It is the same under Protestantism. . . . The State in most cases, the individual reason in a few, imposes the creed upon the Church. The king and parliament in England determine the faith which the clergy must profess and maintain; the Protestant princes in Germany have the supreme control of the symbols of the Church, the right to enact what creed they please.

"Indeed, the authority of the Church in matters of belief was regarded by the Reformers as one of the greatest evils against which they had to contend. It was particularly against this authority that Luther protested. What he and his coadjutors demanded, was the right to read and interpret the Bible for themselves. This was the right they wrested from the Church. To have been consistent they should have retained it in their hands as individuals. . . . To this extent, however, they were not prepared to go. Between the absolute authority of the Church and the absolute authority of the individual reason intervened the authority of the State."

"But the tendency, however, arrested by the State, has been steadily toward the most unlimited freedom of thought and conscience. Our

fathers rebelled against the authority of the State in religious matters, as well as against the authority of the Pope. . . . All modern philosophy is built on the absolute freedom of the individual reason; that is, the reason of humanity, in opposition to the reason of the Church or the State. Descartes refused to believe in his own existence but upon the authority of his reason; Bacon allows no authority but observation and induction; Berkeley finds no ground for admitting an external world, and therefore denies it; and Hume, finding no certain evidence of anything outward or inward, doubted—philosophically—of all things. . . . The method of philosophizing is the experimental. But as the point of view is the outward—matter—spirit is overlooked; matter alone admitted. Hence philosophical materialism. And philosophical materialism, in germ or developed, is commensurate with Protestantism." . . .

"In literature and art there is the same tendency. Poetry in the last century hardly existed, and was, so far as it did exist, mainly ethical or descriptive. It had no revelations of the Infinite. Prose writers under Protestantism have been historians, critics, essayists, or controversialists; they have aimed exclusively at the elevation or adornment of the material order . . . Art is finite and gives us busts and portraits. The physical sciences take precedence of the metaphysical, and faith in railroads and steamboats is much stronger than in ideas."

"Such, in its most general aspect, in its dominant tendency, is Protestantism. It is a new and much improved edition of the classics. Its civilization belongs to the same order as that of Greece and Rome. It is in advance, greatly in advance, of Greece and Rome, but it is the same in its groundwork. The material predominates over the spiritual. . . . The strife is for temporal good. God, the soul, heaven, and eternity are thrown into the background, and almost entirely disappear in the distance. Right yields to expediency, and duty is measured by utility. The real character of Protestantism, the result to which it must come, wherever it can have its full development, may be best seen in France, at the close of the last century. The Church was converted into the Pantheon, and made a resting-place for the bodies of the great and renowned of earth; God was converted into a symbol of human reason, and man into the man-machine; spiritualism fell and the revolution marked the complete triumph of materialism."

Yet, while Dr. Brownson could thus clearly perceive and point out the true nature of Protestantism, his idea of Catholicism was as far as possible from the truth. His idea of the Church was that it was the representation of the spiritual to the entire exclusion of the temporal; the spiritual tyrannizing over and crushing the material order. He looked, therefore, to an ideal Church of the future in which due consideration would be paid to the respective rights of the spiritual, and true harmony brought about between the two. In later writings Dr. Brownson rejects and conclusively refutes this error.

In the article, *Leroux on Humanity*, Dr. Brownson contends for the perfectibility of man, and so far contends for a truth, but he is in error —an error which subsequently he discovered and rejected—in supposing that the means and end of progress are found in the natural, not in the supernatural order. In the *Convert* the story of the author's conversion is told, and the process of his passing through successive errors, and leaving them behind him, is pointed out. In the articles following in the *Convert* in this volume the author reaches the truth, and declares his faith in it in words of unmistakable meaning. In the next to the last

article in the volume he thus briefly describes his position and the steps through which he reached it.

The last article in the volume contains the following declaration:

. . . . "We must have a guide, but do not mock us with a fallible guide. Talk not to us of a church unless you have an *infallible* church to offer us. We have followed a fallible guide long enough. We believe Christ did found an infallible Church, rendered infallible by his perpetual presence and supervision. To that Church we willingly yield obedience."

THE ALTERNATIVE; A Study in Psychology. London: Macmillan & Co.

The author of this work has marked out a new course. He has departed widely from received philosophical terminology, and his system, while studied, is certainly peculiar. Much versatility is shown in the discussion of abstract topics, especially of those which engaged the attention of Kant and his followers, and in fact there is no slight resemblance between the present treatise upon psychology, and the elaborate but unsound productions of the German philosopher upon the same matter. It is to be regretted that the author has obscured his work by the invention of new terms and the use of current ones in an incongruous or foreign meaning. This might be proper, were philosophical knowledge of only recent origin and terms inappropriate or unfixed, but since the thought of the past has bequeathed a rich legacy of superior learning, to disown it is neither scholarly nor useful, and to coin new words for well-known ideas, or to use familiar ones in a strange sense produces vagueness of thought and language upon subjects requiring most precision.[1]

It is beside the purpose of this article to follow the writer in detail through the finished chapters of his treatise; it is possible to notice only a few salient principles which determine the character of the work.

Matter to be explained is usually defined—a habit greatly to the writer's credit, but which sometimes suggests the adage that "definitions are dangerous," "Periculosa Definitio." The author declares himself a disciple of the school of common-sense, and to its influence he attributes many of the positions he holds.

"The treatise," he says, "consists of three books. The first consists of Definitions demanded by a new classification of mental events and faculties. . . . The second treats of Reasoning. The third consists of expositions which concur in showing the dependence of personal agency on self-denial. The first chapter of the third book shows that science is unconscious knowledge.[2]

"The second deduces from familiar mental event the existence of an unconscious part of the mind, and of unconscious mental event. The third proves that the unconscious part of the mind is corporal, consisting of the encephalon, etc. The fourth is an exposition of Wisdom. The fifth proves that man has been for the most part puppet, dupe, and

---

[1] "Necesse est accipere opiniones antiquorum quicumque sint. . . . Et hoc quidem ad duo erit utile. Primo quia illu quod bene dictum est ab eis, accipiemus in adjutorium nostrum. Secundo quia illud quod male enunciatum est cavebimus."—(St. Thos. Lib. 1, De An. Lect. 2.)

"It is incumbent on us to understand the opinions of the ancients whosoever they be; and this for two reasons: (1) because what is well said by them we will receive for our own assistance; (2) because what is incorrectly said we will beware of."

[2] The author seems to mean by "unconscious," what is accurately termed *habitual*; since science is an intellectual *habit*, it is habitual knowledge.

victim of unconscious forces, and that self-denying conduct is a *sine qua non* of escape."[1]—(Introduc., p. 13.)

Again, he says: "This treatise purports: 1st. A reconstruction of psychology; 2d. Exposure of the alternative, that gives the treatise its title. The alternative is this,—either puppet, dupe, and victim of unconscious forces, or self-denying conduct for the achievement of Wisdom."—(Ib., p. 15.)

In our author's view, philosophy "begs a momentous question, viz., that self is given as being a soul, *i. e.*, as being inextended and a monad." A failure here to distinguish between the two ways in which the soul knows itself has caused the appearance of a false assumption. Does the human soul know itself? Each one of us knows *in particular* that he exists, acts, etc., that there is something in him which thinks, feels, and wills. We are directly certain of these facts so far as the question of their existence is concerned. For such knowledge of our own minds and thoughts the mere presence of man's intellect to itself, its self-presence, in our waking moments, is sufficient. It is our inmost knowledge of ourselves; it is not independent, but concomitant, not obtained by ideas and by judgment, yet their inseparable companion, and thence styled consciousness.[2]

As the human intellect does not depend upon matter in existence, being a spiritual faculty, it is capable of a complete return upon itself, or of simple and total self-presence, so that it can be at one and the same time both the faculty knowing and the object that is known conjointly with other knowledge. This is direct perception, and though not an idea accompanies one, and certifies at least confusedly to its existence and the mind's ownership of it, it is chiefly to our ideal and formal knowledge that the scholastic maxims are applicable, viz., "nihil est in intellectu nisi prius fuerit in sensu," "nothing is in the intellect unless first in sense," and "intellectus intelligit scipsum sicut et alia," "the intellect understands itself just as it understands other things." Since the human mind naturally understands objects by ideas expressive of them, and derived from material objects presented through the senses, it understands itself in like manner by an idea expressive of itself while contemplative of an image in the fancy.

This action is less properly called consciousness, for knowledge of its act, its intellect, and self, which the soul thus acquires, is not particular and concomitant perception of the mere existence of such objects, but is our proper intellectual knowledge of them, and, if duly demonstrated, is science.

Some confusion of thought would have been avoided, had the writer more sharply distinguished between image in the imagination, technically called *phantasm*, and idea in the intellect can think of nothing without some representation in the fancy at which to look; but such representation is not the idea.

Concerning creation the author sees no escape from the following dilemma: "The mind . . . . . has to choose between pre-eternal substance undergoing coeval change, and a Creator culpable of a pre-eternity of idleness terminated by a caprice. The former of these hypotheses is burdened by the condition of infinite regress, but it is not inconsistent."—(Bk. 1, c. 9.)

This view seems novel. The keenest intellects of pagan Greece re-

---

[1] "By no means the least perfect part of this book is its analytical tables of contents."

[2] Conscire—cum alio scire.

jected as inconsistent the hypothesis of "infinite regress," or of an actually infinite series of co-ordinate causes and effects. Since God is pure act (actus purus) when his creatures exist *ad extra*, and become actually related to him, he acquires no new relation, indeed, no relation at all; being absolutely pure act he cannot receive additional actuation or perfection. Our author conceives him as if his life were made up of succession as ours is, but eternity is *tota simul*, all at once.

Some propositions maintained in the conclusion of the book state clearly the scholastic doctrine concerning beatitude; the author very correctly makes wisdom the cardinal constituent of the *summum bonum*. This agrees with the maxim of Aristotle, "Beatitude is operation according to perfect virtue," and by "perfect virtue" he understood wisdom.

The inquiring student of philosophy will find in *The Alternative* much to cause reflection, and, though dissent at times be necessary, certain parts must be admired.

MAN BEFORE METALS. By *N. Joly*, Professor at the Science Faculty of Toulouse, Correspondent of the Institute. 12mo., 365 pp. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1883.

The stone weapons and implements of the Indians are turned up throughout this country, in town and city, and are familiar to every schoolboy. Mounds and shell-heaps give pottery, beads, and works, showing some advance beyond the rudest state. Of late years, European archæology has brought to light a host of articles, gathered from mounds, from shell-heaps, which are now pretentiously called *kitchen middens*, and from cave and lake bottoms, evidently used by early races in those lands. They are almost undistinguishable from those of our Indians. The stone arrow and spear-heads, stone knives, grinding stones, hammers; pottery of similar types; the same ideas of a future life shown in burial customs. The present work is one of the popular French scientific manuals, and gathers pleasantly together much of the recently acquired information, comparing the so-called prehistoric European with the American of our time. One source of information has been, however, overlooked by this whole school of European anthropologists, and that is the earliest lives of saints. They, probably, deemed it absurd to spend time reading a mass of monkish rubbish, when they set out to enlighten the nineteenth century from the scientific chair of a professor; but, in sober fact, it would pay as well to dig into that mass as into a Swiss lake-bottom's mud, or an Ohio mound. The earliest literature of all European nations consisted of old legends, and, after the introduction of Christianity, of the lives of the national saints and their wondrous works. Many of the lives are little better than strings of stories of miracles, such as were doubtless told by every fireside. These describe the life as it existed in the country certainly at the writers' times, though they may make anachronisms by ascribing some new customs and articles to a previous age. Now, many articles, modes of cooking, the treatment of the sick, vapor baths, defensive warfare, are constantly mentioned in these early lives, which show that, at the period when they were written or shortly before, correspondences between early Europe and later America were very great. Though the great and noble may have progressed, the poorer and enserfed classes, still in their down-trodden state, lived as their ancestors had done for generations.

Mr. Joly does not seem to consider it necessary to assail religion in order to treat his subject, as so many of the recent French popular science writers do. He makes light of the immense antiquity some at-

tribute to cave discoveries, and, in fact, so far from being prehistoric, much of the Indian-like life led by European tribes falls within the realms of history.

The author treats in succession of the bone-caves, the peat-mosses and kitchen-middens, the lake-dwellings, burial-places, prehistoric man in America, the antiquity of man, and then views primitive European civilization under the aspects of domestic life, industry, agriculture, navigation and commerce, art, language and writing, and religion. The last of these is far from satisfactory, and he quotes from some man named Vogt the opinion as brutally but more skilfully worded by our historian Prescott. A little more philosophy would not impair these men. Sacrifice, as they admit, is an idea universal with the race. Sacrifice, too, always carried the idea of substitution. Man had offended God, and God was to be appeased to the sacrifice of man. That great victim was unknown. Every race sought to substitute a temporary victim. When the anger of the gods seemed great a human sacrifice was required. Man shrank from it, and offered animals, as substitutes for man, and the animals were generally those domesticated and closely connected with daily life. Father Jogues, while a captive among the Mohawks, saw them, after sustaining two or three defeats in battle, offer a bear in sacrifice to Aireskoi, begging him to accept it. They acknowledged that they had sinned in not offering any human victim for a long time, but they promised that they would offer the next captives taken as they then offered the bear. Soon after two Algonquin women were taken, and the missionary saw them offered, consumed by fire and by eating, in honor of the god Aireskoi.

The Jews retained the original revelation of a Messiah; and in Christianity we have the offering of the one victim who alone could appease the anger of an offended omnipotent God. And as Christianity realized and completed the tradition of the world, Catholicity alone, in the doctrine of the Real Presence, brings each believer into union with the Divine Victim. Men rejected it by the Lake of Gennesareth, and the rejection is re-echoed in our day, but they need not insult philosophy and common-sense. If they decline to walk with Christ, they should not glory in it.

PATRON SAINTS. By *Eliza Allen Starr*. First and Second Series. Baltimore: John B. Piet & Co.

"Every day persons are heard to ask: 'What books should we read in order to prepare for a visit to Europe?' The true answer to this question is: 'The Lives of the Saints,' written enough in detail to give the events and circumstances which have most impressed the popular mind, and have thus taken the form of legends. Without some acquaintance with these legends, these traditions, it is useless to try to do more than stumble through the best guide-book in the world. The essential idea in the most precious monuments, the master-pieces of art, is lost."

"We are living in an age of saints, like all those Christians who have preceded us; for the Church of God is always fruitful."

"There is no such key to the present as a knowledge of the past, and the saints of other ages help us to understand and properly to value the saints of our own."

These extracts from the Preface to the Second Series of Miss Starr's book, so well express the nature and intention of both volumes that no other form of words is necessary to introduce them. The new and revised addition now presented to the public, deserves even better of that

public than the one published some years ago. Miss Starr has fully realized the great want of to-day's literature—sound, practical, *pleasing* reading for the young—and has set about the remedy in earnest. She has considered the spirit of this age as well as of the past, and while ministering to the unchangeable qualities of the soul, has not neglected those which the years do modify. In fifty-six sketches of as many well-known saints, she has embodied such legends and traditions as have inspired the artist hand for centuries, and has added, whenever possible, a brief, but clear and pleasing account of such of the artist's work as may meet the eye of the careless tourist, or reward the search of the eager student. The narratives are all well written. That quiet earnestness and grace which Miss Starr has made familiar to the readers of Catholic literature, are admirably adapted to these relations, and serve to impress upon the mind the holy lessons she so beautifully repeats—notably in "The Forty Martyrs of Sebaste." The exquisite and powerful word picture of the winter night with which it opens, awakens the keenest sympathy with the sufferings of the devoted band. The numbing agony of such a death as theirs seems creeping through one's veins, even as one's heart throbs high with increasing love and zeal. Lessons no less inspiring are simply yet vividly portrayed in the stories of other saints, while there are few if any of those details which so often cast the shadow of physical shrinking upon the spiritual glories of Faith, Hope, and Charity, enkindled by the life of a saint. Not that there is aught in the past of the saints to be set aside. Far be it from every Catholic heart to hint at such a desecration! But "time and tide have brought changes to non-essentials." Our fathers' fathers have wrought out for us another existence, so far as physical good and evil are concerned, and, whether for better or for worse, we cannot alter and must accept it. What was possible in the way of bodily penance and mortification for former generations, that of to-day dare not attempt. The very recital sets on edge the strained and quivering nerves of our over-excited and too sensitive temperaments, to the detriment of such spiritual nourishment as we might otherwise draw from our reading. Miss Starr has wisely considered this, and has dealt sparingly in these non-essentials, while bringing to the fore such spiritual models as cannot fail to win and strengthen. They are calculated to afford more than pleasure to a wide circle who would open these leaves in search of nothing higher. Such reading is greatly needed. The enemy has come in upon us with a flood of deadly literature. The young and undisciplined innocently go down into it, and drift away from us upon its poisoned waters. It remains for us to offer in tempting chalices such pure and sparkling draughts as shall invigorate. To those grown old in trial, or drawing nearer to the Changeless Love, there is no bitterness in the strong wine of the old lives of the saints. They supplement such beautiful and tender beginnings of the soul's lore as Miss Starr has offered us, and for which we owe her hearty thanks. It must not be overlooked that the book is illustrated. There are twenty-four etchings of Miss Starr's, after the works of the masters, including the most celebrated names. The paper, printing and binding are all excellent—a dress not unworthy of the real self of the book.

LANDMARKS OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. By *Henry J. Nicoll.* 12mo., 458 pp. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1883.

We are no admirer of compends like Mr. Nicoll's as guides to students of English literature. Enough of each writer and his time should be told to understand what is to be said of the chief works noticed, but

the temptation to wander off into discussions on minor points is very great, and few can resist it. Many, and Mr. Nicoll seems to be one of them, labor under the impression that English literature can have no standing among the literatures of the world unless its anti-Roman character is clearly and distinctly made out. Thus, Chaucer must be a Wicklifite, and More a persecutor, although his own positive assertion to the contrary has never been disproved. The treatment of Wicklif, from a literary point of view, is very vague and unsatisfactory. He gives a page to the later Bibles, showing how all were made by altering and adapting, leaving the King James Bible a piece of patchwork, fruit of many minds, and many schemes, and many dialects. While of the Rheims-Douay, the translation by Gregory Martin, uniform, harmonious, vigorous, embodying all the old devotional language of England, he sayeth naught; yet as a literary work it stands in the same rank as Wicklif's and Tyndale's.

Of More and Latimer we have more biography than literary notice. As he proceeds, the author, however, warms to his subject; but we see his bias on his omitting, among Elizabethan worthies, Parsons, one of the most vigorous writers of English, as Macaulay admits, and Southwell. This is curiously illustrated all through the work, for looking at the last pages we find as much space given to Walter H. Pater as to Cardinal Newman, and the reader cannot discover what book or books exist from the pen of the great master of English prose, for not of a single work of Newman's is a title given.

His temple of English literature is purely insular; no American writer can enter there, or rank with the worthies. Irving, Longfellow, Prescott, Bryant, find no place.

In his general appreciation of literature, especially of our own time, he leans to admiration for the schools in prose and poetry that seek to free themselves from God and a controlling Providence.

ORIGINAL, SHORT, AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCES FOR MARRIED MEN AND YOUNG MEN. Thirty-six Conferences for Each. Intended as a Three Years' Course. By *F. X. Weninger, D.D.*, Missionary of the Society of Jesus. Cincinnati: 1883.

ORIGINAL, SHORT, AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCES FOR MARRIED WOMEN AND YOUNG MAIDENS. Thirty-six Conferences for Each. Intended as a Three Years' Course. By *F. X. Weninger, D.D.*, Missionary of the Society of Jesus. Cincinnati: 1883.

These four series of conferences are published together in two volumes, the series for married men and young men making Volume I., and the series for married women and young maidens making Volume II. They are, as the title-page states, brief and practical.

In his preface, Father Weninger expresses the opinion that conferences on special subjects, and addressed to particular classes of persons, in the afternoon or evening, are more likely to be directly useful than the sermons preached to general congregations at High Mass. Every state of life, he says, has its *special* duties, and the preacher cannot, when addressing a general congregation, speak with so much detail, nor with the same benefit, to a particular class of persons in one particular state of life, as he can when those persons only are before him. He is of the opinion, also, that when a conference is given exclusively for one state alone, its announcement will insure the attendance of the members of that particular state, especially in the cases of young men and young women. In cases, where confraternities and sodalities are established, these con-

ferences will serve as addresses by the directors to the members. They may, also, be delivered before the congregation in common, in the afternoon or evening, and will save overworked clergymen time and labor in preparing original discourses on the subject which they treat.

In the conferences for married men, the whole system of Christian perfection, in its special reference to husbands and fathers, is exhibited under the general text, "*But Joseph was just.*" In those for young men, the duties belonging especially to their state of life are pointed out under the text, "*My son, give me thy heart.*" They are interwoven with references to and follow the life of our Blessed Redeemer, and in each of them, too, Saint Aloysius is held up as the model and patron for youth. In the conferences for married women, the duties of wives and mothers are explained to persons in their state of life by examples and illustrations taken from the lives of women of the sacred Scriptures, make honorable mention from Eve, the mother of the human race, to Saint Ann, the mother of the Blessed Virgin, the general text and basis of the lessons inculcated being, "*Blessed art thou amongst women.*" In the conferences for young maidens, Catholic unmarried women are instructed as to the duties especially incumbent upon them. Each conference has constant reference to the life of the Holy Mother of God, under the general text of "*Mary, the Mother of Good Counsel,*" and at the conclusion of each conference, the life and virtues of some holy virgin are presented for consideration.

CATHOLIC REWARD LIBRARY—in six volumes, respectively entitled:

"Eliane." A tale. By *Mrs. Craven.* Translated from the French by Lady Georgiana Fullerton.
"Tales of Mount Saint Bernard," and other stories.
"A Will and a Way." A tale. By *Lady Georgiana Fullerton.*
"Gertrude Mannering." A tale. By *Frances Noble.*
"Aurelia; or, The Jews of Capena Gate." By *M. A. Quinton.* From the French.
"The Pearl of Antioch." A tale. From the French of *Abbé Bayle.*

CATHOLIC PRIZE LIBRARY—in six volumes, containing:

"Mary Lee; or, The Yankee in Ireland."
"Shandy Maguire; or, Tricks upon Travellers."
"The Cross and The Shamrock; or, How to Defend the Faith."
"Emerald Gems." A collection of Irish tales, comprising some of the best stories of the most popular Irish authors, both pathetic and humorous.
"The Valiant Woman." By *Monseigneur Landriot,* Archbishop of Rheims. Translated from the French by Helena Lyons.
"The Instruction of Youth in Christian Piety." By *Rev. Charles Gobinet.*

CATHOLIC REWARD LIBRARY—in six volumes, respectively containing:

"Examples of Holiness; or, Narratives of the Saints." From approved sources.
"True Servants of God; or, Stories of the Saints."
"Holy Lives; or, Legends of the Blessed."
"Golden Legends for Christian Youth."
"Loretto; or, The Choice." By *George H. Miles.*
"The Governess." By *George H. Miles.*

CATHOLIC BOYS' AND GIRLS' LIBRARY—in six volumes, containing respectively:

"Alice Riorden; or, The Blind Man's Daughter." By *Mrs. J. Sadlier.*
"Willie Burke; or, The Irish Orphan in America." By *Mrs. J. Sadlier.*
"The Festival of the Rosary," and other stories on the Commandments. By *Agnes M. Stewart.*
"The Lamp of the Sanctuary." By *Cardinal Wiseman.* And other interesting tales and stories.
"Wrecked and Saved." A story for boys. By *Mrs. Parsons.*
"Christine; or, The Little Lamb," and other stories.

The above-mentioned works are from the press of Thomas B. Noonan & Co., Catholic Book Publishers in the city of New York. They con-

tain a large number of interesting, instructive, and edifying stories, tales, and legends, from the most approved Catholic authors. They are various in style and subject, some of them being historical, some of them descriptive, some humorous, some pathetic, and some tragic.

Their binding is substantial and elegant, being cloth of the best quality, in new shades of bright colors, superbly ornamented with ink and gold designs.

THE RETURN OF THE KING; DISCOURSES ON THE LATTER DAYS. By *Rev. James Coleridge*, of the Society of Jesus. London: Burns & Oates. 1883.

This volume is made up of a collection of sermons, which, the author says in his preface, were written and preached at various times, and with long intervals between them. Some of them were preached as early as December, 1868, and published in the first volume of the *Sermons*, by Fathers *of the Society of Jesus*, which has long been out of print. Others were at different times subsequently.

The author says that the reader must not expect to find in these sermons that connected and systematic treatment of the great subject to which they refer which would be natural in the successive chapters of a work planned from the beginning to treat the subject; yet they have been now arranged in the order of ideas, have the unity and continuity which usually belong to productions of the same mind, nor is there any great department of the subject which has been left untouched.

The subject itself is a very important one, and one that, it seems to us, it is specially important should be brought in due season and its proper relations before Christians of our own times. The Church has always had this subject before it. To the minds of the Apostles it was ever present, and the Saints and Doctors of the Church, of every age, have likewise kept it in view. Indeed, the first and second coming of our Divine Lord are most closely associated in the ritual and service of the Church. Our Blessed Lord's future coming, in glory, majesty and power, is commemorated, and held up to our minds as a preparation for the commemoration of his first coming into the world, in poverty and suffering, in gentleness, benignity and humility.

The sermons, which the volume comprises, are twenty-one in number. They treat the different parts and aspects of the subject with great clearness and ability, and thus make up a valuable treatise on one of the most difficult, yet most important themes of Christian theology.

AN OUTLINE OF IRISH HISTORY. From the Earliest Times to the Present Day. By *Justin H. McCarthy*. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1883.

In this unpretentious little volume, Mr. McCarthy, while professedly giving only an *outline*, presents a clearer view and more closely connected narrative of the chief incidents of Irish history, than is to be found in many works of four times the size that deal with the subject.

In the first chapter the legendary history of Ireland is recited. These legends, whether based on historical truth or not, are, many of them, beautiful. They have an interest, too, to the antiquarian, apart from their æsthetic character, in the light they throw upon the early Irish character as portraying the distinctive lines along which their thoughts and imaginations moved. In ten consecutive chapters, the Christianizing of Ireland; the Norman Conquest; the Reign of Elizabeth; the Cromwellian Settlement; the Restoration—William of Orange; the Eighteenth Century; Emmet—O'Connell; Young Ireland—Fenianism;

the Land Question; Home Rule—the Land League; and their leading leanings and movements are narrated and exhibited. The latter third of the book is especially valuable, as containing a concise yet very clear account of the history of Ireland and its condition during the present century, and of questions which are still living questions for Ireland.

THE ENGLISH NOVEL AND THE PRINCIPLE OF ITS DEVELOPMENT. By *Sidney Lanier*, Lecturer in Johns Hopkins University; Author of "the Science of the English Verse." New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

The work before us consists of lectures that were originally delivered at the Johns Hopkins University in the winter and spring of 1881. Mr. Lanier intended to recast them to some extent before giving them to the public. The editor of them, however, has not felt at liberty to make any changes from the original manuscript, except to omit a few local allusions, and curtail several long extracts from well-known writers.

Although we do not agree with the author in many of the ideas which go to make up his philosophy of the English novel and ruling principle of its development, yet there is much keen and just criticism in his work, and many important ideas lucidly and beautifully expressed.

GOLDEN SANDS; A Collection of Little Counsels for the Sanctification and Happiness of Daily Life. Illustrated by C. E. Wentworth. Translated from the French. By *Ella McMahon*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1883.

Golden Sands has now been before the Catholic public for some years, and its great merit is so generally and so highly appreciated that commendation seems needless. For the information of those who are not yet acquainted with this excellent little work, we state that it is made up of simple brief sayings and reflections, gathered from various sources and suitable for almost all circumstances in life. They are not profound meditations or didactic instructions, but, as their title signifies, grains of truth picked up along the shores of human thought, and arranged and exhibited in this little volume for the benefit of its readers.

The edition of the work before us is enriched with a number of symbolical engravings, each indicative of some particular lesson or truth contained in its pages.

TRUE SERVANTS OF GOD; OR STORIES OF THE SAINTS. From Approved Sources. Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co.

As its title indicates this volume is made up of narratives recounting the chief incidents and characteristics of a number of the most eminent and well-known saints. The accounts of them are concise, the incidents well told, and in such manner as is well calculated to interest youthful readers.

UNCLE PAT'S CABIN, OR, LIFE AMONG THE AGRICULTURAL LABORERS OF IRELAND. By *W. C. Upton*. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1882.

This is an attempt to exhibit, in the form of a story, the life and social position of the agricultural laborer in Ireland, with its hardships, its hopeless struggle against adverse conditions, too severe for human endurance, and the causes which brought all this about.

PERIODICAL 70741

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM